Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

NATIONAL AFFAIRS
CPSU Central Committee Plenum

FBIS-SOV-91-149-S
Friday
2 August 1991

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
National Affairs
CPSU Central Committee Plenum

FBIS-SOV-91-149-S 2 August 1991

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITEE PLENUM

25 July Speeches

Variant Report of Ilin Speech *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jul]* 1
Burokevicius: National Separatism 'Very Dangerous' *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 2
Denisov: Program Lacking Ideology *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 4
Grachev: Draft Program Must Be Evaluated *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 6
Kalashnikov: Draft Should Be Adopted *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 8
Khitrun: Draft Program 'Far From Perfect' *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 9
Lobov: Draft Program Needs Additional Work *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 11
Makhov: Communists Must Strengthen Discipline *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 12
Malofeyev: Discord at 'A Critical Point' *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 14
V.D. Popov: 'Moment of Truth Has Come' *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 15
Sekretaryuk: Anticommunism A 'Huge Danger' *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 17
Sillari: Party Losing Too Much Time *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 19

26 July Speeches

Guseletov: Program Must Help Win Elections *[PRAVDA 30 Jul]* 20
Kachanov: 'Clear, Precise' Program Needed *[PRAVDA 30 Jul]* 22
Klaucens: Latvian Communists Suffering 'Anxiety' *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 23
Lavrentyev: 'CPSU is the Party of Reform' *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 25
Prigarin: Program Democratic in Nature *[PRAVDA 30 Jul]* 25
Armenia's Sarkisyan: CPSU Must Reform *[PRAVDA 29 Jul]* 27

25 July Speeches

Variant Report of Ilin Speech

PM0108134391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jul 91 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "At the CPSU Central Committee Plenum": "Speech by A.N. Ilin," second secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, delivered at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] The draft submitted by the working group takes into account many of the remarks made during the discussion of previous versions. It is distinguished by a more compact presentation, and some of the ideas in it will certainly be supported not just by party members but also by the majority of Soviet people. What I primarily mean are the provisions for extricating the country from the crisis and establishing civic peace and accord. And now it is important for every primary organization and every party committee, on the one hand, to work out measures to explain this document's contents and, on the other hand, to attract Communists' collective thinking to additional work on it.

At the same time, when determining our attitude toward the draft under discussion, I think that we all are well aware of the lofty responsibility before the party being taken on by the Central Committee and the Program Commission set up by the 28th congress. Life itself confirms the correctness of Lenin's idea that without a program "the party cannot exist as an integral political organism capable of always adhering to its line, at each and every turn of events."

There can be no doubt that the quality of the draft that has been published and its contents will either promote the consolidation of Communists or push them toward a split which is in any event looming as an increasingly serious and real danger.

Unfortunately, in this regard the draft's authors have not succeeded in implementing a series of constructive ideas. Furthermore, their desire for brevity in the document has resulted in the loss of certain important provisions of a fundamental nature, which determine the party's image as a Communist Party. Attention is primarily drawn to the fact that the ideas about the need to restore and develop the fundamental principles of the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin as the base of the contemporary concept of socialism and the CPSU's policy have groundlessly disappeared from the text. Moreover, the authors rank different concepts from our own and the world's Communist thinking on par with Marxism as sources of contemporary socialist theory. We can only guess about the specific concepts in question. The party program must not contain hints and ambiguities. We are bound to proceed from the uncontestable stipulation that this document can be built only on a strictly scientific foundation and is the party's "official theory."

Materialistic dialectics—the living soul of Marxism—does not accept the mechanical admixture of different and at times mutually exclusive world outlook tenets. In our view, this eclectic approach has prevented the authors from offering an objective analysis of the path traversed by the Soviet people under the Communist Party's leadership in the last 70 years. The description of this period suffers from oversimplification, confusion in the appraisal of objective and subjective factors governing the development of and collaboration between base and superstructure and of the role of individuals and the masses in history, and many other shortcomings. The fact that the draft examines this period in detachment from the world's general civilizing process cannot be accepted as normal. The authors have failed to determine the socioeconomic formation to which we belong and what sort of society has been built in the country. The essence is hardly reflected by descriptions used in the draft, like "totalitarian system," "authoritarian bureaucratic regime," "totalitarian dictatorship," and so on. It is impossible to understand what prompted the authors to exclude from this document the tenet, contained in earlier versions, that the real practice of socialism not only maintains and builds up its creative potential in today's conditions, but also has a substantial effect on the evolution of capitalism. It is our profound belief that the program must accurately formulate the real process, must not say even a single word to contradict the orientation of socioeconomic evolution, and must proceed from absolutely accurately established facts. Without this, without a revelation of the internal contradictions inherent in our society today, it is impossible to learn correct lessons for the future and offer a scientific substantiation of the need for perestroyka, of its immediate tasks and objectives, of the ways to achieve them. For example, I believe that the program must reflect the contradictions between labor and the newly-emerging capital, which are something new for us. Today these selfsame contradictions are already taking the form of impoverishment of the bulk of the population, prosperity for "shadow economy" dealers, and numerous conflicts in society. Attempts to resolve them legislatively to capital's advantage generate natural resistance among working people and a buildup of the people's anger, fraught with a social explosion.

Specifically, it is impossible to overlook a fundamental aspect like the disappearance from the draft of the stipulation about the leading role of public forms of ownership and the appearance therein of a flowery thesis about the party's unprejudiced attitude toward the activity of new strata of society, emerging in the sphere of private enterprise.

And it is altogether impermissible that the draft's authors have to all intents and purposes abandoned the working people's social gains, primarily the rights to work, rest, and be housed which are guaranteed by the USSR Constitution.

I would like to dwell especially on the question of democracy. The essence of this process is extremely confused in the draft. Even though the term itself is used on about 20 occasions.

On the one hand, for example, the authors speak of the system of soviets. On the other hand, they seem to overlook the offensive which has been launched and is aimed eliminating the soviet form of democracy.

Initially, the imperfection of the electoral system led to a situation whereby, given the party committees' noninterference, there were virtually no workers' and peasants' representatives on soviets. That was the first stage of "desovietization." This was followed by talk about abolishing these organs of people's power altogether. Let me note, incidentally, that during the first post-October years, in the conditions of our electoral system's establishment, workers accounted for more that one-half of deputies on city soviets.

Here we must admit our mistakes and tell the Soviet people that they have already been deprived of power in some regions. At least in our republic, matters are already progressing toward the establishment of a new regime, based on personal dictatorship, beneath the camouflage of the need to step up executive power. Look at the RSFSR president's decree on political parties and mass social movements. It is a graphic example of the exercise of power which relies directly on violence [nasiliye] and is not associated [ne svyazannaya] with any laws.

Look at the situation in Georgia, Moldova, and the Baltic republics! The question is: What sort of democracy are we talking about?

The question of power is crucial for any political party, and absolute clarity is needed here.

Unless an accurate and courageous analysis of today's situation is provided, unless the abstract idea of the society for which the party is calling is translated into the language of specific and realistic goals which working people can comprehend, the program will be utterly doomed to failure. People will simply refuse to follow such a program.

And another matter. Russia's Communists stand firmly on the position of the need for the CPSU's self-renewal. But what the draft's text projects are not the outlines of a renewed party but of a fundamentally new party. If this is so, then it is necessary to take a clear-cut stance on the theoretical base and the cooperation with workers', peasants', young people's, and other social movements and to accurately define the functions of parliamentary activity. And the main point is this: If we are taking frankly federalist positions in the organizational sphere, then we must seriously review the party's entire normative base, avoiding in this process at least the replacement of democracy by anarchy, of party discipline by irresponsibility.

We must not close our eyes to the fact that, by dint of such a replacement, the CPSU is already losing its ideological and organizational unity. Some platforms and streams are making attempts to form factions and create what is essentially a revisionist and right-wing opportunist wing in the party. A downright splittist and liquidationist activity is pursued by the "Communists for Democracy" movement. Rejecting the socialist and communist ideas, it claims to represent the CPSU in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], and its political activity is at the Russian president's service. In other words, they have resigned from a state party and have joined a "pocket" party. Totally absurd.

However, these facts are also overlooked by the draft's authors. I assume that they must be appropriately reflected in the party program.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize that the questions raised in the course of today's debate are of strictly fundamental nature. They must certainly be taken into account when additional work is done on the document prior to its submission to partywide discussion. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo believes that the process of this document's final revision must make utmost use of everything that is valuable and acceptable from a Communist Party's positions and is contained in the alternative draft programs.

As for our plenum's decision on the question under discussion, we think that the additional work on the draft could be assigned to the commission elected by the 28th congress and that it could be published in the press in its name.

Burokevicius: National Separatism 'Very Dangerous'

PM3107095591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

["Account" of speech delivered by M.M. Burokevicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] Having presented the comments of members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee on the draft CPSU Program to the members of the editorial commission via the presidium, the speaker said that the draft CPSU Program is a document on the basis of which Soviet Communists must consolidate themselves. The complex sociopolitical situation in which the Union finds itself today makes it imperative for the CPSU to appreciate the causes of the crisis and work out ways of emerging from the economic, political, and spiritual crisis, and, I would say, psychological crisis. Without a serious, considered, scientifically substantiated document it will be practically impossible or extremely difficult to do so. The level of vulgarization and oversimplification of scientific socialism has passed the critical point in our country. Ideological pluralism in the CPSU has spawned in it a multitude of political currents that

are weakening the CPSU. And this reflects the stratification of society into particular strata and political forces which undermine the strength of the USSR as a multinational, unified socialist state.

National separatism is a very dangerous phenomenon. It has nothing in common with a union republic's state sovereignty. This is evidenced by the antinational, anti-Soviet actions of the Lithuanian state leadership, which considers Lithuania to be outside the USSR. The law on Lithuanian citizenship restricts the right of individuals holding USSR passports to enjoy civil rights. And as of 3 November 1991 citizens of the USSR are deprived of civil rights in Lithuania.

The law on citizenship of the Lithuanian Republic totally contradicts basic international norms on human rights. The undemocratic approach and nationalism of Lithuania's rulers is also shown by the removal of Russian signs from state institutions, in particular ministries. They have been removed from enterprises under republican jurisdiction and from scientific and cultural institutions. Even street names are now only in Lithuanian.

The documents of a Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputy or Lithuanian Republic employee are written out only in Lithuanian and English. Russian is totally ignored. But this makes a mockery of union legislation.

I am not opposed to the English language, but Lithuania is not part of Britain or the United States so English can be used as the official language of Lithuania.

Any cultivated person has to know several foreign languages, but they should not be in opposition to Russian. It is unseemly. It is an insult to the great Russian nation.

The rights of the Russian and Polish populations are obviously being infringed in Lithuania. The young people of these nations are being deprived of the opportunity to acquire higher education

We Communists are trying our best to correct this injustice. A Vilnius Slavic University is being set up on the initiative of Lithuanian progressive organizations. It will be opened this very year. We are asking the USSR Government to give it the legal status of a union educational establishment. The Lithuanian Communist Party's aim is for all nationalities living on the territory of Lithuania to have equal opportunities for spiritual development.

In order to prevent Landsbergisist separatism from putting down deep roots in Lithuania and prevent the final destruction of Soviet structures in the republic and in order to protect the rights of Soviet citizens and supporters of unity in general and prevent crimes, the first secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee proposed setting up in Lithuania a union law-enforcement system bringing together the organs of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Prosecutor's Office, the Lithuanian SSR KGB, the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] in Lithuania in the form of the transport militia and subunits of the USSR MVD involved in guarding union property, and also the USSR Supreme Court's permanent unit in Lithuania.

I am also raising this question because the resolutions of the Third and Fourth Congresses of USSR People's Deputies on restoring the Soviet constitutional system in Lithuania are not being fulfilled, in particular by the USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the union government. Indeed, Soviet laws are not operating in Lithuania and not a single union law or USSR presidential decree is being implemented. Supporters of the Soviet Union, and there are more than 1 million of them, are losing confidence in the ability of union institutions to properly resolve even one question concerning Lithuania. And this greatly perturbs the Lithuanian Communist Party.

I must say that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has done a very great deal for the Lithuanian Communist Party. It is greatly to Comrade M. Gorbachev's credit that the Lithuanian Communist Party has remained in the CPSU's ranks. We are grateful to him for his principled stance in January 1990 during his stay in Lithuania. We know how much the Landsbergisists and other Lithuanian nationalists hate Comrade M. Gorbachev. At the same time, Communists and supporters of the preservation of the USSR expect the USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to act more consistently in implementing the decisions of the Congresses of USSR People's Deputies on the Lithuanian question.

The Novo-Ogarevo meetings involving the leaders of nine union republics and the USSR president are obviously a fine phenomenon. But there are various views of them in Lithuania. The Landsbergisists and the Sajudis separatists in general rejoice that the "nine plus one" documents allegedly virtually acknowledge Lithuania as being outside the Soviet Union and that the documents allegedly show that the USSR leadership is already resigned to the idea of Lithuanian independence outside the Soviet Union. And this puts Lithuanian Communists in a very difficult position. Obviously, the leadership of the CPSU and USSR should pay more attention to the opinion of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and consult with the Communist Party.

Indeed, we are Communists and the future of the Union is something we hold dear. It can only be preserved through consolidation among Communists of the Soviet Union uniting on the basis of a CPSU Program that strengthens the CPSU's positions in all spheres of Soviet society's life.

In issuing his decree, citizen B. Yeltsin, president of Russia, intended to smash the CPSU and, above all, the Russian Communist Party, as a political organization of Soviet society. The fate of the communist parties of the other union republics depends a great deal on the fate of the Russian Communist Party. Lithuanian Communists

are totally on the side of the Russian Communists. I believe that the USSR president will provide a proper legal assessment of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president's unlawful act.

In accordance with the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet law of 25 September 1990, the Lithuanian Communist Party has been outlawed, that is, prohibited, since 1 January 1991. Lithuanian Communists face imprisonment. The Lithuanian Government is continuing its offensive against democracy. The Lithuanian MVD and the Landsbergisists' Territorial Defense Department and State Security Department have been instructed to ensure that meetings of officials to discuss political matters are not organized at workplaces. But we are doing active work. Particular vitality has been sensed at the level of primary, rayon, and city party organizations since the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee ninth plenum, which discussed the question of the Lithuanian Communist Party's tactics at the present stage.

Yes indeed, Lithuanian Communists are having a hard time. Because the wave of nationalist hysteria has not yet broken and people are trying to label us as opponents of Lithuanian sovereignty and call us traitors. But we will stand firm. Because we are acting for the good of Lithuania. We are in favor of state sovereignty for Lithuania, and it is our belief that this is a realistic possibility only in a renewed Soviet Union.

Things are difficult for us because a wave of anticommunism, developing into fascism, is sweeping Lithuania, the Union, and in general many countries.

Things are difficult because they are trying to portray us as extremists wishing to bring back absolute rule. But at the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee ninth plenum we made an official proposal to all democratic forces on cooperation, on the possibility of a compromise even with the republic's government on the basis of a realistic concept for extricating Lithuania from the crisis, and on the creation of a Lithuanian coalition government.

Things are very difficult for us because they are trying to hold us responsible for everything, including things we are not involved in at all. They are using all manner of means in an attempt to discredit us. But we will stand firm. People in Lithuania realize that there are no partyocrats, nomenklatura types or extremists among us. That the privileges and high pay are to be found elsewhere—among the Landsbergisists. People are gradually realizing that the mafiosi and terrorists, the usurpers of power, the owners and bosses of the disinformation systems are to be found in the Lithuanian separatists' camp.

Things are also difficult for us because our opponents call us conservatives. If you so wish you can say that the claim that two times two is four is dogma. In Lithuania today people are increasingly realizing that, in fact, it is not we who have displayed a dogmatic, philosophically speaking, metaphysical stance, but those who have risen above the people, calling themselves saviors of the Lithuanian mentality and saviors of the Lithuanian nation, Lithuanian sovereign economy, and independence from the USSR. Who would dare call this dialectics and flexible thinking? Yet it is this style of thinking and action that has prevailed in Lithuania with the help of unbridled criticism of Marxism and Leninism and the theory of scientific socialism.

Guarantees of Lithuanian sovereignty are laid down in the Union treaty. We are in favor of Lithuania signing the new Union Treaty. Our experience also enables us to see more clearly the features of the draft CPSU Program we are discussing today. The draft CPSU Program that has been presented should be a more flexible and scientifically substantiated document which will unite the country's Communists. It is good that it is now more attractive from the literary viewpoint. As I see it, its main shortcoming is that because of its brevity it is too abstract.

In conclusion, M.M. Burokevicius called for the CPSU Central Committee plenum to adopt the draft as an acceptable basis for discussion in CPSU party organizations.

Denisov: Program Lacking Ideology

PM3107153191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 4, 5

["Account" of speech delivered by A.A. Denisov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of a USSR Supreme Soviet commission, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] First of all, I would like to warn you that although I am a member of the CPSU Central Committee, nevertheless I am no politician, I am a scientist. And in this capacity so far as I am concerned there are no sacred truths, there are methods of understanding nature and society. That is the main thing. Truths arise as a result of applying these methods, that is, as a product of the process of cognition.

We constantly try to make the air resound with some kind of sacred truths that allegedly exist. But they simply do not exist in nature, it is in our imagination. Regardless even of who uttered these words, whether it was Marx or Lenin, because for them too this was also a product of cognition. For them, these things were not sacred truths. They were how the result of analysis of society looked at that moment. But since then 150 years have passed in one case, and nearly 100 years in the other case. We have to make allowances for age, so to speak. All truths become obsolete. Why do they become obsolete? They become obsolete because they are relative. Whether they are thrice objective, they are still relative. It is absolutely necessary to recognize the relative nature of truth, because this is a recognition of the

need to improve it by means of practical trials. But we are still trying to proclaim something, whether it be capitalism or socialism.

You see, capitalism during the time of Marx was one thing, but now it is another. Socialism in that time was one thing, but now apparently it does not exist at all. But I would say the reverse, that now there are two socialisms: There is totalitarian socialism, which we have all endeavored to create, that is, inhumane, undemocratic socialism, and it came from the fact that we took the French Revolution's famous slogan "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" but only defended the last two, equality and fraternity, and forgot about liberty. Furthermore, we tried to achieve equality and fraternity by disdaining liberty. We tried to achieve both of these by force and now we are reaping the fruits of this violence.

And furthermore, we created a society which was simply abominable from the point of view of a purely human approach. It was scientific to the extent that it could be, given the relativity of knowledge of any science and the relativity of any scientific model. But it was abominable because of its inhumanity.

So now we have finally realized that it must have a human face. Science is science, but the trouble is that we are now trying to rush in the opposite direction and forget our science.

I would like to state again: No scientific models are absolute, they are approximate, and we have to treat them as models. They must be improved by practice, but they must not be rejected because then we would have pure social democracy, that is, pure pragmatism. There is nothing bad in this, but in my conversations with many social democrats at one time or another, I have frequently heard envious remarks to the effect—you have some kind of science, though it may be lousy, but we don't.

And why is science necessary? It provides an opportunity to predict the objective course of events. It is the objective course that is particularly important, and not our imagination or our violence.

Where did Stalinism come from? They say that Stalin was an appalling man, so he thought it all up. But this is not true. He was a bad man, of course, but, for all that, objective circumstances pushed him toward this. Why? Because socialism did not proceed of its own volition. The external obstacles seemed to have been removed, but it did not work, it did not work spontaneously, the conditions were not ripe.

What is socialism according to Marx, what is social development in general? It is the objective course of history. That is, the voluntary, natural course of history. But it did not work, so let's do it by force. Force based on the absolutization of scientific knowledge—that is where totalitarianism came from. This can only be done at the expense of freedom.

Now we are trying to come to our senses. What do we need in order to do this?

First of all, we need to purify our science, once we have agreed that it is out of date, and that it simply needs to be renewed. There is nothing terrible in that, that is the requirement of dialectics. Dialectics is the permanent renewal of science, this is a part of science itself. We simply refuse to take this into account, because it is much easier to harp about sacred truths, without thinking that they need to renew all the time. But they do need to be renewed.

Let us renew our Marxism. It will continue to be Marxism because the basic and main thing, that is, the method of cognition—historical materialism—has not been discredited in any way. On the contrary, we must renew Marxism on the basis of the imperishable nature of one circumstance: Historical materialism has fully proved its value as a method of understanding society. Why has it proved its value? Because capitalism has moved toward socialism. And it has been doing this since the 1930's—and we must open our eyes and finally see this. I believe that the first step was taken by Roosevelt, who started the strict planning and programming of the development of that, the most capitalist of societies. This was borrowed from socialism. Capitalists do not need to be controlled or programmed. They need absolute freedom. They are liberals. And liberalism is based on just this, complete freedom, including freedom of exploitation. That is what capitalists need. But people started programming them: You can't do this, you can't do that, monopolies are out, antimonopoly legislation and programs were put in place. Look how many programs have been under way since the 1930's—programs against poverty. Does a capitalist need this? No, this is a socialist program. As for programs against unemployment, does a capitalist need to fight unemployment? He needs unemployment! This increases his profit norm. There are heaps of programs like this.

Now look at the plans, for example the Marshall Plan. What is that? It is the deliberate planning of the development of destroyed postwar Europe. And, I would like to stress again, Europe was restored systematically, efficiently, and in a planned way. How do our plans compare with these plans! So borrowing is still going on. And this is not borrowing on the principle: We like it so we will borrow it. This is a requirement of the times, it is the objective course of history. That is what we have to understand. The old capitalism has long been trying to become socialist. Of course it is getting stuck. It does not want to admit that Marx was right. Of course it does not want to take that path. But it is doing so because history is forcing it to.

We have all tried to philosophize on this path and while we busied ourselves talking nonsense, capitalism embarked on this path by itself. Furthermore, I believe that as of the year 2000 or soon after, the prospect of communism will really appear.

This may make some people laugh, but let us analyze the processes going on all the same. And the processes are again going according to Marx. What is the main thing in Marx' historical materialism? The main thing is that mankind is fighting for spirituality. It needs material development only as a basis on which it will move toward spiritual freedom, because if you are starving you will not think of spirituality. That means we have to make a minimum provision for ourselves, so that we do not have to think about our material provision, and then occupy ourselves with spiritual development. And we are heading toward this.

Feedback can be observed here. People always say: Is it possible to ensure distribution according to demand? Proceeding on the basis of philistine psychology, a consumer society is impossible because our appetites grow faster then the possibilities of satisfying them. But there is a noticeable, very noticeable tendency for demands to decrease with the growth of culture and education. This is a fact. Furthermore, the pressure of the ecological situation and ecological disasters is becoming increasingly fierce. It is forcing us to limit our demands regardless even of whether our minds are ready for this or not.

What is to be done? We cannot increase the number of cars in Moscow, first, because of the traffic jams and, second, because there is no air to breathe. How much can we put up with! You might think that you could give everybody a car, but this will soon be impossible. And not because there are insufficient cars, or insufficient money, but because it is physically impossible to provide this. So we will restrict these demands. And not only we, but the whole world. And this will create the conditions for distribution on the basis of reasonably limited need. When this becomes a reality then the apotheosis of spirituality will begin. And this will happen soon, by God. And we cannot reject this prospect and the understanding of this prospect, because it will happen all the same. And the point is not whether somebody believes in Marxism or not, but the fact that there is no getting away from it, this is the objective course of history and it has proved itself. Therefore it is totally necessary to declare such things in the draft. This shows that we all understand what is going on in the world and and that we have not rejected materialist analysis of historical processes.

So let us get back to the program. It is all theory. Of course both Marx and Lenin said a great deal, proceeding on the basis of concrete analysis of the situation in which they were operating. Well, what is to be done? I could list many things here. But that is not the point. We just have to look through things and weed out things that were unnecessary. For example, the absolutization of the form of ownership. Because with any form of ownership there is exploitation with great pleasure. Furthermore, any monopolism of ownership is a question of power.

We say here—public ownership. But where did the monopoly of public ownership lead—to the power of bureaucracy. And this is inevitable, these are not just some kind of subjective eccentricities, this is a natural progression, it is a materialist explanation. If the bureaucracy essentially owns all property, then it rules. If we now institute the supremacy of private ownership then we will have power exercised by money. And not because of someone's ill will, and not because Yeltsin or somebody or other wants this. It is not enough to want. But according to the objective course of events—if ownership is in the hands of someone with money he will rule, he will buy up everything he needs and he will rule.

Therefore we need a mixed system if we want a society with a human face. There must be a balance of forms of ownership and a balance of interests, and then a democratic solution, all kinds of consensuses, and the resolution of contradictions are possible. And the program implies this to some extent although without any scientific substantiation.

As far as I am concerned, I am not simply a Gorbachev supporter. I am a supporter of Gorbachevism, that is, centrism in the party. And what is centrism? In a certain sense it is divine inspiration and a bit of a mishmash. This is inevitable. But after all it is not just a mishmash, but divine inspiration too. And you can accuse the program of whatever you like, but you cannot say it is a product of divine inspiration. Divine inspiration, that is, theory, is missing.

But this does not mean that the draft is completely unacceptable. Furthermore, I agree with everything it says. But such a program is very good as a platform for the consolidation of society. For a broad coalition of various parties. As an election program it is excellent. And if you remove the mentions of communism and socialism from it (I say this without any irony, quite seriously), it will be a wonderful platform for interparty consolidation. This is our external election program. It must be seen in this capacity. But apart from that, we must have a party program that reflects our ideology. We must do this.

But this, admittedly, is just one option. Another option is to supplement this program with divine inspiration, so to speak. And then it will be acceptable.

Grachev: Draft Program Must Be Evaluated

PM3107132191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 3, 4

["Account" of speech delivered by A.S. Grachev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] I agree with the speakers preceding me who spoke about our plenum's in a manner of unprecedented significance. In a certain sense it can be likened to the congresses at which the decisions to create our party were made.

We are not just resolving today the question of the CPSU's future program, but essentially choosing the character and the path of the new renewed party, a party which at long last, once it gets its new lease of life, will be able to restore organic contact with its own society, with history, and with the world community.

In this sense we must properly evaluate not just the proposed draft program but also the report delivered today by Mikhail Sergeyevich, because these things are inseparable. I think we must not create the impression that we did not hear it or grasp the extent to which the CPSU must become a fundamentally new party if it is to be a party worthy of the end of the 20th century.

About the program. I think the text is worthy of being published in roughly its existing form for two reasons. The first, and perhaps not the main, reason is its theoretical aspect, although I do not think that questions of detailing the future society which we intend to build in our country lend themselves to such minute elaboration. In general the problem of defending and developing socialism is, I think, no longer theoretical but to a considerable extent practical.

In discussing the submitted draft program in the CPSU International Policy Commission we heard the wishes of comrades who spoke of the need to formulate more specifically what democratic, humane socialism is. I am not certain that the time for this has now arrived. For such definitions you require not new words and phrases, but a new social reality that is still only just emerging in our country. While remaining a party of social justice and the expresser of the interests of broad strata of working people, our party must build up the necessary information in order to determine how the social landscape of our country will change under the impact of the "transplant" of a market heart. And specifically, how the very strata of working people on whose behalf we hope to continue to act will behave in the new economic, social, and political conditions. How we can avoid an orientation toward the outbreak of freeloading attitudes and the demands of essentially lumpenized strata, how we can avoid losing touch with the process of reforms and its main social agents—the skilled working class, the scientific, technical, and creative intelligentsia, leaseholders and cooperative members, the number of whom will increase geometrically, and young people.

Regarding the technical aspects of the draft program, I want to formulate a few more wishes. I would like, in particular, the description of the Marxist-Leninist basis of our theory and policy to mention the elements of utopianism incorporated in them from the outset, which played an extremely pernicious role at the stage of the implementation of these concepts. On the other hand, I think that it would be advisable when making an historical assessment of the October Revolution to give more prominence to the new values of democracy, social justice, and national independence which have entered not only Soviet but world politics in the 20th century.

I would like our perestroyka to be put not just in a national but an international context as an attempt to answer the problems of not just Soviet society but world development. I think that not enough is said in the draft about the problems of the reunification that is at long last possible in the workers and democratic movement, which split back at the start of the century. This is a specially important factor for modern politics as it is this democratic movement of left-wing forces which could serve to cement the new world internationalism.

And yet the theoretical aspect is not, in my opinion, the main aspect for the submitted draft program. The most important is the political aspect, and specifically the fact that the draft program reaffirms not just our party's socialist choice but also the political choice made in 1985 and enshrined at the 28th congress. This task is particularly necessary because we now observe in our party a situation where the very possibility of reaffirming this choice is becoming a problem for a whole number of its members, including certain leaders.

I regard the recent publication (just a few days ago) in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA as evidence that this is quite an acute problem. This, by the way, is just one example of how some organs of the party press prepared for today's plenum.

I think that the document, which was signed by quite a distinctive group of people—party functionaries, writers, and a whole series of military chiefs—and which describes the perestroyka years as a "huge unprecedented misfortune" for our country, does indeed show that it is a matter of contradictions in our midst which should be clarified not just at this plenum, but at the upcoming congress.

It seems to me that the panicky style of the publication and its highly ambiguous appeals contain elements of destabilization of the fragile social accord which has recently begun to take shape in our society. (Murmuring in the hall.) I think that in terms of their political impact such publications can work in roughly the same destabilizing way as the latest decree by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president.

I would like to talk about one more factor which it is important to reflect in the future draft program. This concerns the assessments of our foreign policy activity that have been voiced recently. Both the document which I referred to and certain other political declarations adopted at meetings in party organizations contain, in my view, unscrupulous insinuations that the objective of the new foreign policy is virtually to sell down the river not just our national security but also our national dignity. But why do we not recall the degrading dependence of our prostrate economy? Even the last, record harvest did not save us from having to purchase foreign grain. Why do we not recall the dependence of the most modern sectors of our industry, science, and technology on foreign countries? Or the fact that our state and sometimes our party organs too devote a considerable

amount of their time to distributing coupons for scarce overseas goods. Surely this is degrading for a great power? And surely the attempt to make our economy into a vital and active one is an attempt to ditch this dependence?

Finally, Yu.A. Prokofyev said here that radicalism is the alternative to conservatism. To use the terminology widely current in the world, the alternative to conservatism is reformism. This is the dividing line between the main, most influential political forces and political parties abroad. I would not like to see a time when the initials CPSU are interpreted as Conservative Party of the Soviet Union, because then the place of the reformists will indeed be taken by the radicals.

Kalashnikov: Draft Should Be Adopted

PM2907121191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

["Account" of speech delivered by V.V. Kalashnikov, head of department at the Leningrad Ulyanov (Lenin) Electrical Engineering Institute, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] As the party headquarters, the Central Committee should be able to predict the political consequences of the decisions that are adopted. If the plenum expresses its negative attitude toward the draft today or tomorrow, but the Program Commission makes use of its right to publish it, we will be taking a very big step toward a split. In other words, the negative effect of rejecting the draft has been programmed. But will there be a positive one? I am familiar with all the drafts of the program that have been prepared by various trends in the party, and I can state immediately: Not one of them is of a higher quality than the document that has been submitted. All of them can be criticized from one point of view or another.

Thus, if we do not take this document as a base, then we will only make the discussion more acute, and we will end up with one that is no better. This draft can be revised very quickly. I believe that it must be adopted as a base, that the commission must be instructed to introduce some of the most vital corrections within a week, and publish it. Certain important corrections and stresses must be made without fail. Thus, for example, on page 7 there is a paragraph that says what is the vitally important task for the party at this critical phase. The proposed text emphasizes the need to uphold the policy of profound democratic transformations. One year ago, at the 28th Congress, such an assessment would have been correct, but now, from our viewpoint, the following wording would be more correct: "At this critical phase, we must uphold and confirm the socialist direction of perestroyka," and then according to the text. When the fourth—the last but one—version was shortened, the previous stress on humane, democratic socialism as the party's strategic aim disappeared. The term itself only appears on the penultimate page, that is, page 21.

I propose that the previous approach be restored: After listing the immediate tasks, the conclusion should be made that they are aimed at achieving a strategic aim, and a broader definition of humane democratic socialism should be given.

Obviously it is very easy to take these observations into account. There are far more complex things, but it would be useful if these were resolved. I am worried by the fact that we have not explained the reasons that made us virtually reject the old concept of socialism and arrive at the new one.

Take the question of the market. This is one of the most important elements in the new vision of the socialist economy. Yet the draft devotes one sentence to this subject. When tasks in the economic sphere are listed, the formation of a market economy is there along with the others. At the same time, the need to use the market is explained in a very condensed and narrow way: "The market is the means of stimulating the growth of the productivity of labor." How and why the market is this means, how it blends with the socialist method of production, what kind of market we need—there is no explanation of this. Obviously in a list of tasks such explanations are out of place, because they disrupt the harmony of the exposition, but in principle they are necessary because these are the new things that make this program different from the previous one. Where could this be done in the shortest and most condensed way? In the analysis of the lessons of the past, from which new tasks should ensue.

But our specific requirements are not connected with and do not ensue from the general initial position concerning the market, since it is simply not in the text. This not only reduces the theoretical level of the program, but also makes it unconvincing for the substantial stratum of party members and non-members who cannot overcome their traditional antimarket psychology. And it must be overcome for many reasons. Without this, the party will first of all not be in a position to implement a proper economic policy, second, it will not obtain support from the active strata of the population which want to work intensively and gain from the results of their labor, instead of feeding a group of idlers, and third, without this the party will not ensure the consolidation of its ranks. This is perhaps the most important and most difficult task to date.

It is obvious that a pre-Congress discussion is already starting. And not only about the draft program, but also about the assessment of the results of last year. And the year was a difficult one. The party had to retreat on a number of important issues under pressure from the opposition, and it had to make difficult concessions. Antisocialist forces are imposing a model of the market on the country that is completely different from a socialist model. The USSR's future as a federative state is being jeopardized. Under these conditions, some of the party aktiv is giving the Communists simplified explanations, to put it mildly, of the reasons for the

prevailing situation. Supporters of Nina Andreyeva and the Initiative Congress see these reasons as the deliberate or at best unintentional desire of the party leadership to weaken it and return us to the bosom of capitalism. Such explanations hide a deliberate or at best an unintentional attempt to justify one's own inactivity and inability to work in the new conditions, and sometimes even a frank attempt to acquire political capital by playing the role of "bold" accuser.

Naturally I put the word "bold" in inverted commas, because this kind of thing can now be done without fear. Unfortunately these comdemnations are received more easily by some of the ordinary Communists than an objective analysis of the reasons for defeats and concessions. And maybe it is worth playing up to these moods? Exploiting them? Heaping all the blame on the general secretary and turning a new page in the party's activity? I believe that this is not only an immoral path, but also an impasse. Because if we accept Nina Andreyeva's interpretation, or an "initiative" interpretation of the reasons for the crisis of perestroyka, we will be obliged to accept their leaders and their prescriptions for getting out of the crisis.

And what are these prescriptions? In the economy it is a policy aimed at cutting instead of developing market relations. In politics it is a policy aimed at tough confrontation with the republics, particularly with the Russian president, who is now supported by the majority of the population. Obviously, it is by no means the whole party that is prepared to accept the prescription of the Initiative Congress. So what will happen then? A split? Is there a way of avoiding it? At the moment there is.

During the pre-Congress discussion, apart from a draft program, the Central Committee should offer Communists an objective analysis of all factors that have determined the party's activity in the past year and give a fair assessment of the work of all its components. It is objective and fair assessments that will quell the emotions of some and weaken the arrogance of others, and make it possible to understand the dialectics of mutual dependence in the actions of the upper strata and the lower strata; the Central Committee and the local party committees; and the party committees and ordinary communists. In principle, these dialectics are recognized by everyone, but not everyone is prepared to use them in assessing their actions.

I recently read the CPSU Moscow Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] Plenum resolution which says that the general secretary is pursuing a policy that is not fully in line with the policy of the 28th Congress. But in it the following question was not asked or answered at all: whether it was possible for him to pursue the outlined policy with the disposition of forces that had formed following the elections of Russian people's deputies and following the declaration of sovereignty, which sharply reduced the possibilities of the Union organs of power. But after all, the future of every deputies' mandate was decided at local level, and depended in many ways on the activity of local party committees, and the very obkom that adopted this resolution. I believe that the time of the basic mistakes and lost opportunities was the period between 1985 and 1989. Then we still had both economic reserves and political levers to carry out radical but socialistically oriented reforms. Who is the most to blame for the fact that time was wasted? Gorbachev, or those who held onto his apron strings and those who did not know how to work and hung onto their posts?

Since the summer of 1990 we have been doomed to concessions, compromises, and blows like the recent superdemocratic decree of the superdemocratic Russian president! Whoever had been at the helm of the party during that period would have been forced to make a choice: compromise or civil war. A responsible politician could only have chosen the first path.

But this difficult period is drawing to a close. Whereas before our opponents acquired political capital by criticizing the CPSU as the ruling party, now the time is coming for them to answer for the policy they pursued. And this policy is explosive.

Under the influence of "Democratic Russia," the republic parliament adopted a law on privatization which opened up many possibilities for the legalization of capital acquired by criminal means and for transferring the most profitable spheres of production into the hands of shadow economy dealers. And the working people cannot fail to react to the specific lessons of such privatization. A change in public awareness is inevitable. A clever and strong party will be able to use it to defend the socialist orientation of perestroyka. But we will only be clever and strong if we stop looking for enemies amongst ourselves and instead look for a correct policy and for people capable of executing it. That is our main task on the eve of the upcoming 29th CPSU Congress and during it.

Khitrun: Draft Program 'Far From Perfect'

PM2707142191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 91 Second Edition p 3

["Account" of speech delivered by L.I. Khitrun, first secretary of Ryazan Oblast Party Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] Communists from Ryazan Oblast party organizations believe that the adoption of the new CPSU program is extremely pressing. They have had an opportunity to study in advance the program's text, which was sent to party committees. Communists associate the country's further consistent advance along the path of social progress, as well as the party's extrication from the protracted crisis and its radical renewal, with a clear and realistic action program. The program's purpose—and on this point we agree with the opinion of the commission for its elaboration—is to provide answers to current

questions, to serve as an ideological basis for the consolidation of Communists and all champions of the socialist choice. To a certain extent, the commission has succeeded in achieving this.

There is undoubtedly much to recommend the draft document, the speaker noted. An attempt has been made—in conformity with the demands by partymindedness, scientific approach, and historicism—to correctly emphasize politics, the economy, and internal party relations. It is worth noting the fundamentally new section "Lessons of History," written from positions of objectivity, harsh realism, and businesslike restraint.

At the same time, the draft is far from perfect and calls for considerable additional work, methodological amplifications, and elimination of bottlenecks [uzkiye mesta] which diminish its political value. In the first place, it still fails to answer the question: What are we? And even if it does answer the question, the answer is ambiguous. The draft says: "The CPSU today is a party of democratic reforms, a party of ideological and economic freedom." What has been emphasized more here? Desire to please someone or attempts to really waive principles? We have always called ourselves Communists and our party—communist. And that has been the source of our main ideological values and principles.

When studying the draft, one gets the impression that these principles have been diluted into general phrases and statements. One would have thought that the chapter, "Our Principles," should have very clearly declared Communist principles. But no such principles are visible behind the verbiage to which people are long-accustomed and have, moreover, become allergic to such general statements.

These points are more suitable as basic avenues for the CPSU's activity, but here there is no mention, or almost no mention, of principles. They ought to be stated briefly, clearly, and simply, listed without any special explanation. In our opinion, the section in question is the most vulnerable one.

The draft program does not make it clear how the draft's authors perceive our party. A parliamentary, narrow organization or a genuinely political party closely associated with working people and striving to gain their authority and, of course, power. However, a contradiction emerges. Speaking of the immediate tasks, we think like a party which is in power. But we make no statements at all in this regard, we take on no commitments in this sphere. This is hardly in conformity with the principles of a serious political organization.

In the speaker's opinion, the fundamental principles of socialism—' Whoever does not work, does not eat" and "From each according to his ability, to each according to his labor"—are missing from the draft. Unfortunately, the draft in question contains hardly any theory, and the promise not to impose abstract schemes cannot justify this shortage. The strength of Marxist-Leninist theory has always lain in its methodological accuracy and purposefulness, and this was despite all the "illusions" of Marxism. Nobody has ever abolished either the explanatory or the forecasting functions of theory. This goes to explain some other shortcomings. Specifically, the absence of an analysis of the society which we have built. What is it? Socialism or some other kind of society? At least this is the question that springs to mind when reading the list of defects on page five. The document contains virtually no analysis of the society's economic structure. How are we to tackle the deployment of political forces in society without this? We cannot, and have no right to, reject this cornerstone of Marxism—the base economy, the economy which determines society's foundations—especially in today's alarming time. This being so, there must be an analysis of the economic system and its structure without fail. Look no further than the formulations applied to agrarian policy. Are we deliberately avoiding words like "kolkhoz-sovkhoz production"? After all, this is our reality. Are we avoiding words like "cooperative system" and "specialization of production"? Peasants in the world's agriculture cannot for a moment imagine themselves without cooperative system. And yet we are afraid of these words which testify to the major and highly mechanized farming we have created, capable of assimilating the achievements of scientific and technical progress. Why deprive ourselves?

In the light of the events in recent years, the strikes, and the mass exodus of workers from the party, the CPSU program must more firmly and clearly declare the position of the working class in the Communist party and in society, as well as its role in the country's renewal.

The text of the draft new program, L.I. Khitrun went on to say, logically leads to the conclusion that the CPSU today is the party of all working people. But this conclusion is absent from the draft which was sent to party organizations just before the plenum. True enough, these positions were formulated much more clearly in today's report by Mikhail Sergeyevich. Therefore, a lot has been left to guesswork and this is not to the program's credit. It is hard to agree with the attempts by the draft's authors to somehow differentiate anew between categories of workers engaged in mental labor. In their opinion, scientific engineers, designers, and workers in literature and the arts are representatives of the intelligentsia, while teachers, physicians, people employed in various spheres of social management, servicemen, and staffers of law enforcement organs are classed among the social groups of state employees.

There is need for amplification in the draft's historical section. Paradoxical though it may sound, a study of the draft at times gives the impression that the Communist party is not always fittingly represented in the CPSU program, an impression that the document's authors were ashamed of something. Are we trying once more to please someone, and is it fitting for us to take such a bashful stance even in today's atmosphere of unbridled anticommunism?

The draft correctly emphasizes that we are not idealizing the past but we are not rejecting it either, that we are evaluating historical experience in all its contradictory nature.

While openly admitting the misfortunes, miscalculations, and gross political mistakes of the times of Stalinism and stagnation, we must not forget that even then Communists were the first victims. The new program must demonstrate the Communist party's outstanding role during the Great Patriotic War and the restoration of the national economy which was destroyed by the Hitlerites, something about which the present draft keeps modestly silent.

In the light of contemporary realities, the program ought to indicate not only whose interests are expressed by the CPSU, but also what it is that the party rejects. The draft notes that the party is prepared for broad cooperation, but does not indicate the parameters and framework of such cooperation. The text even contains a sentence (obviously an editorial slip) to the effect that our party will cooperate with communist and socialist parties. It was obviously meant in international terms which were translated into domestic, and this sounds paradoxical.

Concluding his speech, the first secretary of Ryazan Oblast Party Committee dwelt on the shortcomings in the document's organizational structure. The program ought to comprise a preamble, whose main element should be the historical section named in the draft, followed by several chapters which must provide answers to the main questions. First, what does the CPSU offer by way of objectives, principles, tasks, and long-term tasks? Second, whom does the party support and what does it reject, with whom is it parting company? Third, whose interests does the CPSU express? And fourth, what and who promotes the party's radical renewal?

Thus, the program now being developed must, on the one hand, analyze in depth the essence of sociopolitical and socioeconomic changes which have occurred in the country. On the other hand, it must specify the current and long-term objectives, define ways to achieve them, and bring proclaimed program principles in line with actual reality.

Lobov: Draft Program Needs Additional Work

PM3107090791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

["Account" of speech delivered by O.I. Lobov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] The party has created the society in which we live today at the cost of incredible effort and even sacrifices. We are perfectly well aware of the complexity of the situation, which is increasing with every hour and day that pass. At the 28th congress I voiced the idea that before building a democratic society the main motive forces should themselves be democratic—above all the CPSU.

Let me make a proviso straightaway: This does not mean that it has to be renamed or that we should give up the distant goal for which the party was set up. Assessing the quality of the draft CPSU Program, I must agree with those speakers who said that it lays the foundation for the consolidation of various forces, for consolidation of the party itself—but only the foundation—and it requires substantial additional work and discussion by the whole party aktiv, the whole party, and the country's entire population.

Let us suppose that strategy is our strength. We are close to unanimity on this. What about tactics, what about the everyday questions that life brings up? I must say that we are systematically behind schedule and often lag behind events, as is indicated by the changes in the Baltic and events linked with the presidential elections, the abolition of Article 6, and a number of other events.

We often miss the first events that take place in the Union or autonomous republics and inflate the situation when it concerns the largest republic—the Russian Federation.

I would remind you that we remained silent about the presidential elections in a number of republics by direct ballot and show of hands, but mounted a terrible debate: Is a presidency needed in the Russian Federation at all, at what time, and by what undemocratic method. I think that we have only lost out through this.

A number of questions facing society have to be answered. What is to be done about resolving nationalities questions? Both theory and practice are silent on this score. And this section of the program is extremely modest. We still certainly cannot brag about successes in this field.

We have not voiced a clear opinion either on the question of what is to be done about combining posts. We have been saying for several years now: Is it a good thing to combine state and party posts? Is it a good thing to combine state posts and various posts within movements, and so on?

Last, a word about enterprise. A wait-and-see position has been adopted once again. Listen to what the draft program says: "The party has an unprejudiced attitude toward the useful activity of the new strata of society that are forming in the sphere of private enterprise. At the same time it opposes the shadow economy and attempts to make a fortune at other people's expense." That is, everyone who tries to work in the new sphere of private enterprise automatically comes under suspicion.

I certainly favor stepping up the fight against the mafia and the shadow economy. But when we relate these issues solely to private enterprise, we are thereby casting apersions on all entrepreneurs and at the same time

diverting attention from the fact that the mafia can be present in state, cooperative, and party structures and even in public movements.

So we should single out this section and maybe even reinforce it. If we admit that enterprise has legitimate rights in our society, it is the duty of a party that aspires to the top role in society to support this sphere and find healthy forces there, maybe even promoting cadres from its own ranks into that area of activity.

Incidentally, in America, along with the fact that there is enormous experience of the work of exchanges, there are also state structures working with these exchanges—structures that our country's party, soviet, and state organs lack.

Now a word about the exploitation of man by man. We bashfully hush up the fact that exploitation has flourished in our society, but it has been exploitation by the bureaucratic machine, administrative arbitrariness, and various structures that we set up.

At the same time we have sometimes gone a very long way in democratization. Business circles in various countries are still amazed at how we could have adopted a decision on the universal election of leaders. Here too the party has no clear-cut stance today. Concerns and associations have been set up. They are not efficient in their existing form today. That is one of the main reasons for the economic collapse.

A concern cannot be a cozy elective system. A state concern should be controlled by the state. If a concern is a joint-stock concern, it should be controlled by the shareholders.

In our country a concern is the worst form of kolkhoz, where leaders are not responsible to the owners of the property.

I want to talk about my attitude to the Russian presidential decree. I realize that the decree needs no defense. It is a complex issue and one about which it is very hard to speak today. But I would first like you to think before you vote against this decree. Why did it appear? Could we answer the following question: How many parties are permissible at a single enterprise? How many party committees? Or will we try to record the existing number of party committees and not notice that life is taking its own course? Not notice that "Uralmash" has long since decided to evict the party committee from the enterprise. We did not react to or discuss the the question of Armenia when a similar decree was adopted there. We did not react to a similar decree in Georgia. Now we want to adopt a decision on the Russian decree rapidly and in haste. The statements made by the Russian Communist Party Politburo and Central Committee are also hasty. They have said that the activity of trade unions is prohibited. I do not see that in the decree. It says there that the activity of trade union's organizational structures should be regulated by a contract between the administration and the labor collective. There is no ban on trade unions there. But you must know that transnational companies in most countries, including South Korea, Thailand, Taiwan, and the Philippines, only set up enterprises on condition that for the first few years these enterprises had no trade unions. You think that the publication of the decree is specially designed to coincide with the plenum in order to engender confrontation, but I don't think that is the case. As party members, as members of the Central Committee, we must think about not setting the two presidents at loggerheads and not causing ourselves or them any harm.

Makhov: Communists Must Strengthen Discipline

PM2907133791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition p 3

["Account" of speech delivered by Ye.N. Makhov, acting chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] The 28th CPSU Congress adopted a resolution on preparing the draft program, which stated that it had to be drawn up on the basis of the Program Statement. The Central Control Commission must evidently express its view on this question from this standpoint.

In the opinion of the Central Control Commission, the submitted draft program accords, on the whole, with the tasks set by the 28th party congress. It reflects and develops the main points in the CPSU Program Statement. At the same time I would like to voice some of our doubts.

Any program must provide the answers to fundamental questions: What must the party be like? What aims does it set itself? What does it offer every Communist? And this is particularly important in the contemporary complex sociopolitical situation in the country, when the question of removing the Communists' party from the political arena is being posed bluntly. You cannot help wondering: What are the sources of the malicious attacks on the party? On the party which expresses the working person's fundamental interests? Why has our party experienced such political upheavals and human tragedies, for which many people today are demanding repentance from Communists and even their trial? Answering these questions, the speaker said that this is evidently partly because for decades there was no true democracy in the party. The uncontrolled nature of its former leaders' deeds flourished. And control in the party was not only disparaged but reduced to the level of subservience to these leaders. It would frequently become the champion of their antipeople policy. It was no coincidence that the development of the regime of personal power in the party began with the elimination of control organs in the party in 1934 and the physical annihilation of its leaders.

Unfortunately, underestimation of control in the party can still be seen to a certain extent today. Certain party leaders have never understood the new democratic role

of the party's control organs. And this is borne out by the just-ended process of forming the existing structure of control organs, which have at times been set up in accordance with "curtailed" democracy.

The submitted draft of the CPSU Program, which was drawn up in conditions of the party's further democratization, also underestimates one of its chief constituent parts. This, in the opinion of Ye.N. Makhov, is the enhancement of the role of control functions on the part of Communists and party organizations. This is literally mentioned in passing in the text. We believe that in the draft it is necessary to supplement and maybe even reinforce the point about strengthening Communists' discipline, obligation, and responsibility for assigned tasks and for adopted decisions. And, at the same time, not forget about such questions as party comradeship, fellowship, mutual assistance, protection of constitutional rights, and the honor and dignity of Communists.

Unfortunately, the draft does not give a complete picture of the characteristic attributes of the party that is being reformed, of the difference between it and other political formations, or of its development prospects. And yet this is the basis for forming any political organization. It is no coincidence that our opponents are hitting us in just these painful places.

The draft raises the question of the possibility of platforms being created within the party. Whereas the 28th CPSU Congress decisions permitted the creation of these only for a period of holding internal party debates, what is now proclaimed, I will quote, is "freedom to unite around party platforms." No mention is made of censure for the factional struggle. Proper attention is not devoted to the problem of the emergence of factions and trends which aspire to the role of independent parties. This is the present reality of the party: Mikhail Sergeyevich has spoken of three or four parties. But we count up to 10 trends and platforms in the party. This prompts us to draw conclusions for the future. The speaker described as a serious mistake by the Central Committee and the Central Committee departments their plainly inadequate attention to such new phenomena as the emergence of trends and platforms within the CPSU framework, speaking of this with complete conviction, for he personally has met in the Central Control Commission with representatives of certain trends and platforms, with Comrades Prigarin, Lipitskiy, Sergeyev, Kosolapov, Tyulkin, and others.

If we call for concord to be sought even with opposition parties and movements, we must be able to tolerate the views of our comrades in the party and seek what unites us and what useful things we can take from one another. Although, and I have said this to my comrades, I do not share but condemn the lack of political culture, the insulting tone of accusations, and the tub-thumping way of expressing positions and assessments. But if we have recorded in the CPSU Statutes the right of a minority to champion its position, this must be observed unswervingly. Without, of course, going outside the framework of what is permitted.

The Central Control Commission resolutely condemns what certain leaders of platforms are doing, particularly those of the Initiative Congress, and we say so bluntly. This will result in a split in the party before the congress. We probably would not have arrived at such a state of hullabaloo and self-laceration now if we had clearly followed our own adopted decisions, including the party statutes.

The draft CPSU Program can, on the whole, be accepted as a basis [for further work]. Naturally, it requires serious additional work. It is expedient to include in it also everything that is rational for the party from the alternative drafts and from the speeches which have been made here and, in particular, I am sure that many wishes and suggestions will be expressed during the discussion after publication. The program must be a consolidating document for all Communists and for the various trends and movements within the party and be attractive to people. The Central Control Commission plenum also advocated approving the new program at the extraordinary 29th congress, and this must be done before the end of the year.

In our opinion, it is probably now time for the party to develop immunity and countermeasures to the various kinds of "ideas" and provocations being foisted on the party. And we are adopting them for execution, so to speak, and starting to work on them. As a rule, these political provocations are staged before important political events. In time for the present Central Committee plenum we "received" the anticonstitutional, antidemocratic, and I would say dictatorial decree of the Russian president on departyization. The Central Control Commission plenum issued a statement on this question yesterday.

The time and the situation in the party demand the fundamental enhancement of the organizing role of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat. Naturally, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo bears the brunt of the responsibility for the situation which has taken shape in the party.

At the beginning of this year the Central Control Commission, in accordance with the right granted it by the congress, analyzed the work of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat in fulfilling the 28th CPSU Congress decisions and strengthening discipline in the party. The Central Control Commission Presidium's memorandum on the results of the check was forwarded to the Politburo. However, Mikhail Sergeyevich, it has not yet been examined. Of course, the Central Control Commission Presidium is also to blame for this. We are evidently also lacking in the proper persistence.

The speaker supported the thought aired at the plenum that the reasons for the Politburo's organizational incapacity have already been enshrined in the statutes, but he emphasized that this does not diminish responsibility for the work being done.

There are many complaints against the CPSU Statutes. There are many reprimands from Communists and party organizations. I judge this from the mail to the Central Control Commission, Ye.N. Makhov said. Therefore in the time remaining before the extraordinary 29th party congress, and this is already being talked of, apparently, as a question that has been decided, it is necessary right now, in addition to preparing the program, to generalize the proposals of Communists and party committees with regard to altering individual points in the statutes. Maybe it is worth discussing the CPSU Statutes right now in parallel with the program. Maybe it is worth creating a commission for this or defining another mechanism to take account of the generalizations and proposals coming in from party organizations.

On the threshold of the 29th congress the chief task is to rally the party's healthy forces. It is necessary to complete the work and publish the draft program as quickly as possible. We must go away from this plenum in great concord. We still have a chance of gaining in strength and regaining the people's trust. Political feuds within the party must take a back seat, and the sensible, considered, and reasonable nature of actions must come to the fore. We will arrive at the congress and adopt the program, and then, I am sure, there will be a parting of the ways.

Malofeyev: Discord at 'A Critical Point'

PM3107114191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

["Account" of speech delivered by A.A. Malofeyev, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] I recall the last Central Committee plenum with a feeling of bitterness and annoyance. It introduced new discord into our party and strengthened Communists' distrust of one another, including distrust of the leadership.

Essentially the Communist Party—if we call a spade a spade—has been elbowed out of the elaboration of state policy. Even Politburo members do not have a real chance to participate in it. At the same time, there are growing attempts to shift onto it all responsibility for society's disintegration and specific people's mistakes.

Within the CPSU itself discord, ferment, lack of coordination, and the threat of a clear split have reached a critical point. You cannot fail to see the rising tide of anticommunism. The CPSU is increasingly the object of attacks—and of arbitrary treatment, I would say. Its opponents, who have donned the garb of democrats while ignoring the Constitution and existing laws, have mobilized and organized everything for the party's forcible destruction. If this carries on, it could prompt certain forces to undertake physical reprisals against Communists. This is a breeding ground for dictatorship and a return to the worst times of our past. I think that such phenomena just cannot be underestimated now.

Tension in society is growing, the economy and finances have been absolutely shattered, and industrial and agricultural production is collapsing, which is on the point of threatening to leave people without work or a crust of bread and without protection from shady characters and the criminal world.

Some people at the upper level of the administration are nurturing the hope that the solution to the situation has to be found in the widescale application of free prices. But this, I think, is a delusion. People will not stand yet another prices blow. If this happens a severe social explosion cannot be avoided which could completely undermine—and it will undermine—trust in authority, at all levels moreover. The Belorussian Communist Party's position here is unequivocal. Everything must be done to stop the fall in the population's living standard. This is the main question of the day. Without an answer to it all our conversations and any discussion of the finest program will become absolutely pointless.

And when at this time you hear the words that the people support everything taking place in the country, naturally you cannot agree with this at all. People approved of what was associated with the first years of perestroyka, but its present state provokes acute alarm and criticism among the population. You get the impression that the ship of state has been cast adrift to the mercy of the elements. Maybe someone thinks otherwise, but I at least am forming this impression. Of course, it is the completely innocent people who will pay for this. Life will become increasingly miserable and hard for them.

It is obvious that the current personnel of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat will find it hard to change the situation in the party and to breathe new life into it. It is indisputable that, whether we like it or not, the question of convening the next CPSU congress—in the next few months, moreover—has come to a head. Although we should be under no illusions. The congress will not be able to resolve all questions if the party itself does not study them properly. Therefore the Program must be a uniting factor. And if it does not meet the necessary requirements, not just one party might be formed after the congress. And this danger must be borne in mind.

As regards the Program itself. I myself am a member of this commission. Much has been achieved in the draft; there are successful positions and provisions. But, calling a spade a spade, it must be said bluntly that in its present form the draft does not meet Communists' expectations. We do not need to adapt to the various political trends that have arisen in the party recently; their views and

approaches are in many respects unacceptable, but, I think, they should not be discarded. Everything sensible that can be utilized during the document's finalization must be picked out.

The draft under consideration contains a set of universally democratic provisions. On general terms, I will say bluntly, they are attractive provisions, but they are more characteristic of a party of a social democratic orientation. The identity of the political party—namely ours—that professes communist ideals has been lost in this draft. The CPSU, in the event that this Program is adopted, will practically cease to be a party of political action. The draft lacks a mechanism for implementing the set goals, and this is really the main thing from which we are now suffering. It is not at all clear how unity of actions can be achieved by a party which is based on such hazy organizational principles. The draft even proclaims the payment of membership fees a voluntary matter: There is the option of chipping in a 10-kopek piece. To my mind that will not do. Let us be frank and admit that the words on the document's title page that this is the Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have not yet been filled with real substance. There is time for this. And I think it can be done. And the draft should undoubtedly be adopted as a basis.

The question arises: Can the congress be put off until the scheduled time mentioned? I think not. It is necessary to help the commission drafting the Program by forming temporary groups in the central committees of the republic communist parties, in the oblast party organizations, and in the party organizations at major industrial enterprises to enable them to systematize and generalize what the party masses are now producing and to introduce the appropriate amendments into the draft Program.

Discussion of the draft must be maximally utilized for consolidating and reinforcing the party's authority and regenerating trust in it, which has been severely shaken. But, of course, it must not be allowed to draw Communists into intraparty feuds. But too many such wishes are appearing at the moment. This is precisely what the initiators of the "Movement for Democratic Reforms" have pushed us into. And the point is not that another new political trend has appeared. At the present time that is in order. I personally have no allergy to that. The main thing is who and what stands behind it. They include the superintendents of perestroyka—people invested with trust and authority who had the chance to implement perestroyka's initial schemes. But they have not done so. Now, in perestroyka's seventh year, they are tossing out to the masses slogans and appeals to save the Fatherland. Such virtuosity can only be marveled at. The demarche of the "nine," to my mind, is nothing but the desire of a section of its representatives (not all) to shift responsibility for their own personal blunders and mistakes onto the whole party and onto all rank and file Communists. That is not logical.

I am once again compelled to talk about a topic that is very painful and very thorny for Belorussia—the Chernobyl tragedy. You will say to me: "Why does this topic crop up every time?" Because it is not getting due attention. For the sixth year many thousands of people continue to ask us what will happen to their children. What will happen to their grandchildren? What will happen to their nearest and dearest? And I will say bluntly that there is every reason for this.

People are angered by the indifference of certain central departments to their misfortunes and suffering. I am not laying it on thick, that is really the situation. Back in April the USSR Cabinet of Ministers prepared a draft resolution on additional aid to a number of affected regions. However, it is still negotiating the mazes of the highest departments, while the procedure for financing the Chernobyl program for the coming year which was recently proposed by the USSR Government is actually forcing us to go round enterprises and republics cap in hand. I will say bluntly: This is simply inconceivable, it is simply intolerable. I think this is an ill-considered step and it will be rectified.

Today the CPSU has another chance to recover, to rid itself of its ills, to get its second wind. For this, however, personal ambitions and group interests must be cast aside, and everything must be united on the basis of the general Program in order to extricate society from the current crisis situation and save the party from disintegration. I believe that today there is no goal for us that is more worthy and responsible, and therefore this is where all efforts must be channeled.

V.D. Popov: 'Moment of Truth Has Come'

PM3107120191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

["Account" of speech delivered by V.D. Popov, chief editor of the journal DIALOG, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] I believe the moment of truth has come for us Communists. The moment of truth has come for society and for the people. What is the moment of truth for the party? Yes, it is relative, but there is another criterion: Where is the party at in practice? What lies in store for it? The first scenario was delineated very realistically in the report: a split. What might that bring? Well, a split is a split. The party could end up in fragments. Or something more serious, something larger could appear, something that could lay claim even to a strong party. To a renewed party, a new type of party.

The second scenario is disintegration. Disintegration is also a real possibility that would lead nowhere. There is a danger here. If there was a split or particularly if disintegration occurred, Communists might leave the CPSU and go nowhere, to no party or movement. So the question is: What are we discussing today? What kind of document? I believe the main criterion for assessing the program is the degree of civic accord achieved on the

basis of it. I believe that the program basically corresponds to this criterion. So I am voting for its principles and for publication of the draft.

But at the same time I would ask you to think about something. About the practical goal and about the expediency of the program, about our efficiency, and about the democratic prospects. Let us note that in the future we could face the threat—this has already been mentioned, and I agree with the comrades—of a new form of totalitarianism. The signs of it are already discernible. A new form of dictatorship, if you like. Democracy should be sacred to us, as a form of people's power. And a weakening of the democratic foundation on which the CPSU still rests today presents precisely the opportunity to have no real opposition and to make successful progress toward a new form of totalitarianism.

I share the draft program's thesis that both Marxism and Soviet and foreign socialist thinking are the party's theoretical basis. Not just Marxism. Let us take neo-Marxism—I would cite Erich Fromm, who upholds the idea of collectivism, for example, in the work "Escape From Freedom." Why not use it? Or let us take a look at "Economic Philosophy" ["Filosofiya Khozyaystva"]—a book by our compatriot Bulgakov that has just been published. Can we not get from it and from all our Soviet thought everything that is useful? Or are we going to deny ourselves? Furthermore, I ask myself: How much Marxism did we have here? How much real Marxism did we have? Here I switch to another problem. In my view, there is no party ideology in the draft program. It is a lacuna; I talked about it at the Program Commission, I wrote a special memorandum, so I have a perfect moral right to mention it here.

What do I mean? Comrades, deideologization has confused matters for us. Basically, no party can actually develop as a politically alive and functioning organism and as a political force without its own ideology. What is needed now is not deideologization, but reideologization, the elaboration of a new party ideology. In this sense I favor the fundamental renewal of the party on the basis of a new, innovative Program. But there is not enough economic ideology in it. What is that? It is the ideological expression of the fundamental interests of the social basis on which our party rests or which it would like to acquire, to gain in society. What do we have in this case? It really bothers me, for example—I have talked openly about this and will continue to do so—if the party fails to speak out on the most burning issue for honest working people—that is, on how the working people's living standard is going to change in the future, whether it is going to change at all, and how to struggle to improve it. In this connection I want to address the comrades from the Cabinet of Ministers who are present here. Let us not talk about days and hours or about deadlines; we have burned our fingers on this many times before. My question is: Will the decline in the living standard be halted? Or will the living standard sink further? Let us talk here about the realities that exist today. Our standard of living was reduced by between one-half and two-thirds in April, and if that trend continues is the party going to tacitly accept it? If so it will have no future with working people.

Second, we talk about the market and we call for a market. In this case I want something concrete. Comrades, we must decide on the type of market. There are several markets in the world. The Japanese market is one thing, the American market is another, or take the Chinese market. Or the EC market. I was in Italy, where they were making farmers pour milk away. Why? To prevent prices from falling on the European market. There is self-regulation in the market, but there are also external factors and regulation by human intelligence in the form of the state. The market is a system. The market has certain essential properties; I am not going to list them all here, or it will be more like a lecture. But if you remember Marxism, the market is movement of goods and movement of capital and their obligatory growth. There are producers and consumers in the market and they are intrinsically and inextricably linked. The market has other properties. What do we have? If you take the market formula according to Marx: commodity-money-commodity and money-commodity-money, with us this formula operatives in the first case along speculative lines, that is, commodity production does not increase. In the second case the formula that operates here is: coupon-money-commodity. Comrades, as yet we are a long way off a civilized market, and the Communist Party must be honest with itself and with the people about this. There is another, final factor. I must say right away that I occupy centrist positions and there is something here that I want to make clear.

Let us look at the call for global liberalization, individualization, that is, general privatization on the basis of private ownership. It won't work here. I am talking about the inner mentality of our people. Lenin said: You cannot leapfrog the people.

I agree with Yuriy Anatolyevich [Prokofyev] that traditions have to be reckoned with. What we have gained over the past 70 years has to be taken into account. Be it bad or good, it is our reality and it has to be reckoned with and treated as a natural historical process. This means that we should take into account not only traditions, but the objective demands of progress. If we consider the age-old traditions and all the property of the multitude of large labor collectives we may conclude that private and general privatization will not work now. Well, it could work, but only through a counterrevolution, with all the inevitable consequences. A return to state socialism with its state form of exploitation would not work either. A revolt is possible today, but only through a counterrevolution. What is the optimal path? I will tell you: Implementation of a policy and ideology of liberal collectivism for the transitional period at least.

What is that? Above all, the priority of individual freedoms and rights and the possibility of their implementation in the collective and with the help of the collective. So for the transitional period, whether we like

it or not, collective privatization must be the dominant form. But one must not be afraid of private ownership. The party must have a program saying how to make every working person an owner of property. An owner on the land, an owner at the plant or scientific research institution—this is the basis for the transition to a socially just market. Shaping the ideology and mentality of the owner means shaping the market's spiritual infrastructure.

A mechanism of destatization and privatization is needed. Observations show that it is difficult to effect an immediate 100-percent share flotation in the case of large enterprises. It has to go through stages; what you need to do is not dive in, but, if you like, employ active moderation, balance, economic competence. And, of course, a policy of common sense.

In conclusion, I propose that we adopt the draft program as a basis, publish it, and publish the other programs as well. Let the people themselves decide the priorities. But we must earnestly and intellectually stand up for our priorities in a competitive environment. I agree, considerable work still needs to be done on the draft program (I am a member of the Program Commission). It is very important that the masses should have an active perception of it. All programs have undergone devaluation in the public mind. Stylistically even, and I am reminded of the Lenin-Plekhanov program, see how it is written. It is theoretical, it is practical, and it has an immediacy about it. This program must conquer the party masses and not be seen as something from another world.

Sekretaryuk: Anticommunism A 'Huge Danger'

PM2807095191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 91 Second Edition p 3

["Account" of speech delivered by V.V. Sekretaryuk, first secretary of Lvov Ukrainian Communist Party Oblast Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] Anticommunism and national-extremism are a huge danger to our party and country. The CPSU Program should say so.

We can change our party leaders, we can close party committees at enterprises, we can deprive party organizations of their property, we can dance the cancan on the ruins of party committees, but the party, like religion, cannot be abolished. This is shown by our history. Mass-based parties are not produced by individuals but by dint of historic circumstances. The party apparatus can be identified with the party, we can continually cry "shame" about certain political leaders and stir up the people against them. All these are dangerous and extremely immature political games. And ultimately their aim is obvious to everyone—to remove one's opponents from the political arena, morally stifle them, and take their place. That is how genuine pluralism is seen by certain new groups and parties in our Western Ukraine.

I recall something I heard a worker say at a meeting: "Of course, we cannot live in the old way. But we cannot live the way we're living now." That is the view of a working man, which will objectively give rise to a demand for social justice or for what we call socialist choice.

Criticism of socialism in our country has taken the form of hysteria and moral terror against Communists. The mechanism of this criticism is very simple and targeted at superficial emotions. The fiercest critics are people who served yesterday's ideas and did quite well out of it. Today they are striving to besmirch the past and are doing so with no less skill than the fiercest national extremists, who hope to prosper by serving new gods.

I live and work in the Western Ukraine. This area has had a complex historical fate. The history of its talented, industrious, and genuinely long-suffering people, wedged between sundry empires and totalitarianism, has not been easy. These people have fought long and hard for the right to be an integral part of the whole Ukrainian people. Their struggle bears the imprint of the tragedies of our time. It was imbued with desperation and impatience, which sometimes took ultraradical and brutal forms. Today the aim of our political enemies is to morally compromise and discredit their opponents at all costs. Sometimes in the spirit of a political smack in the kisser.

I sympathize with those trusting, tenderhearted listeners who are daily served the horrors of the Stalinist repressions as if they happened yesterday, in an attempt to create the impression that other innocent people were never exterminated by anyone else anywhere. That no guilt attaches to the Ukrainian nationalists, that they did not march alongside Hitler's SS, and that they were not the people who wrote reports on the number of cartridges used hunting down peaceful citizens.

Our opponents are trying to give international import to their every action. Their actions are poisoned with hatred. They cannot understand that this hatred is consuming them from within and is probably the most serious obstacle to the great cause of national revival.

Their method is simplicity itself: To derive political advantage from the tragedy of the past, to accuse us of every sin under the sun, and to present themselves as saints.

I would like to point out to our opponents that historically they are somewhat behind the times. Presenting anticommunism as a political innovation, they have failed to note that, although this trend of political thought still exists, it has long since ceased to be fashionable in the West or an opinion which is heeded over there. Anticommunist propaganda is compounded tenfold by the legal nihilism that has entered our life, and by the weakness of the authorities, which are not even attempting to prevent the spread of propaganda preaching hatred and a split in society.

For the most radical of our opponents—and not only them—it has become a kind of rule of political behavior to whip up hatred of Communists, and sometimes even to call for their destruction.

In our region's history June is a month of sad anniversaries and events: The start of the Great Patriotic War, the NKVD repression against the local population in the last days before the Red Army's retreat, the first mass pogroms against the Jewish population, and a terrible crime notorious throughout the world—the shooting of the Lvov scientists and cultural figures. It is a time when the Rukh leadership and newly created political organizations and parties, with the support of certain soviet leaders, Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] deputies, and deputies from city and oblast soviets, staged a planned, well-rehearsed, and extensive campaign to rehabilitate and whitewash the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Ukrainian Insurgents Army [OUN-UPA] and the ideology of Ukrainian nationalism. Nationalist actions occur every day in Lvov and the oblast: The unveiling of a memorial to Konovalets, the OUN ideologist; so-called days of commemoration for the Ukrainian freedom fighters and the victims of the Bolshevik terror; the setting up of memorial plaques and symbols to OUN figures; a congress—hypocritically called a "people's veche" [popular assembly in medieval Russia]—of former Bandera followers to mark the dubious occasion of the 50th anniversary of the 30 June 1941 restoration of Ukrainian statehood under the protection of "Greater Germany;" a torchlight procession of nationalist youngsters in the best traditions of Hitler's storm troopers, and other similar events.

Alarming new trends have emerged in the oblast: A fertile environment is being created for "brown" ideology, because lauding the ideas and actions of the OUN-UPA today means being inspired with hatred and working for a new split in society. The newly created parties and movements are conducting active work aimed at replacing the existing system, discrediting the CPSU, the Ukrainian Communist Party, and the oblast party organization, and bringing about the collapse of the Union. They are using various slogans to call for civil disobedience and the organization of strikes.

The process of uniting all opposition forces in an interparty anticommunist bloc and of setting up various committees and councils has begun. Under the pretext of providing protection for Rukh, the newly created parties and associations are organizing paramilitary subunits, guard patrols, youth camps, and other things. They clearly want to lead the workers' movement and step up the moral pressure on Communists. A furious propaganda campaign has been launched against the signing of the Union Treaty. The so-called oblast civic accord committee, headed by the chairman of the oblast soviet, is demanding that, in the event of the treaty being signed, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet deputies should lead acts of civil disobedience and use various means of struggle.

All this confirms yet again the correctness of the draft program's provisions on the threat of nationalism. I would make this term more specific by using the concept of national extremism. Time is introducing this clarification.

One other point. The program thesis—that we oppose belligerent anticommunism—is patently inadequate. We need the state's laws to ensure a plurality of opinions and competition between ideas in a form acceptable in the entire civilized world. But they should not allow the propagandizing of moral terror and hatred of people who think differently. In this specific instance the people who think differently are Communists. In Lvov Oblast we are the political opposition, whom the law should also protect.

Working in the exceptionally difficult conditions of opposition, we have perhaps for the first time really assessed the attention we have received from the CPSU leadership, the Ukrainian Communist Party, and the country's Communists. In our complex position it is a great thing to sense the support and words of approval of party comrades, and we sincerely thank them for this.

Our oblast party organization advocates convening an extraordinary party congress not to indict certain party figures, not for "witch-hunts," and not to provide a clash of ambitions and complaints, but to seek out the clearest and most realistic course possible in today's historic maelstrom of events.

Experience of working in opposition forces us to draw certain conclusions. Communists in the oblast party organization realize that today, more than ever before, a great deal depends on us ourselves. We are charged with preserving the party, actively influencing sociopolitical life, and gaining authority among the people. We have learned to live under sustained political pressure. The oblast party organization has its own characteristics and has preserved 2,500 party organizations. They number 78,000 Communists. Admissions to the party have not ceased, the party press is working actively, and we have learned to use the other mass media more meaningfully. In the past two months oblast committee apparatus workers have taken part in more than 200 party meetings. People believe us and want to believe in the party leadership and the country's leadership.

The nucleus of the oblast party organization is made up of Communists who, in terms of their convictions and conscience, have made a conscious choice. They are the real strength which is capable of getting the party out of crisis, resolving fundamentally new tasks, and acting with confidence. At a time of ever increasing attacks on the party and the current generation of Communists—who did a great deal to overcome our tragic past—we must see our party as the most important element in society's equilibrium and the balance of diverse political forces. It is one thing to change the nature and operating system of this mechanism, but destroying it would not be a solicitous act, and would actually be dangerous. It

would be an act of new totalitarianism, the totalitarianism of the street and of the cunning rabble-rousers of our time—a time of perestroyka and unlimited democracy, which is turning into the opposite of that. Let us recall that there is democracy and there is ochlocracy—rule by the people and rule by the mob, often an aggressive and uncontrolled mob prepared in its blind ferocity to sweep away first others and then its own.

Socialism as a centuries-old idea of social justice will live, struggle, fall, and rise again out of the realities of economic existence every day and independently of what we may want. By dint of circumstance it will be incarnated in new political trends and parties, whatever they may be called. We are one such—a party which has come a long and dramatic way, recognizing the majesty and tragedy of struggle and finding in ourselves the courage to surmount our past and openly submit ourselves to the harsh verdict of history. Our experience is both a warning and a lesson. In this sense it is of abiding importance.

In conclusion the speaker said that actions against Russian Communists constitute fear formalized by decree. Nobody, not even the new presidents, will succeed in doing anything to Russia's Communists.

Sillari: Party Losing Too Much Time

PM0108102891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

["Account" of speech delivered by E.-A.A. Sillari, first secretary of the Independent Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 25 July]

[Text] We can only salute the bravery of the those who formulated the draft and submitted it for discussion, knowing how fierce the opposition will be from the section of the party that does not accept radical transformations in society or in the party itself.

I said "bravery." But strictly speaking it is not bravery. It is a direct and profound awareness of the danger that menaces society and the party if these radical changes are not implemented. The danger of the party being rejected by the majority of the people, of the full-scale exodus of sensible people from it, and the transformation of the party into an order of swordbearers. The danger of an escalation of confrontation, destruction, and an increasing slide away from democracy and the economic reforms capable of turning the country into a civilized state.

Our party has already lost too much time. After starting the process of perestroyka in society, for too long it marked time in the matter of its own internal development, reappraising the limits of its influence. And now we really need a great leap forward. And not just a leap but a breakthrough.

Let us be honest with ourselves: The program issue is essentially the issue of the Communist Party's future.

It has to be said that the draft has turned out to be **reformist**. It allows us to speak of the repudiation of many of the ideological and theoretical canons that for decades were unshakable.

The draft has turned out to be **progressive**. It allows us to speak of a new look for the party. And this is reassuring. If we manage to adopt this draft program with appropriate additions and supplement it, in Comrade Denisov's words, with "divine inspiration," then the party **will have** a future. With this new look, I think the party will be able to win back people's respect, the respect of those whose faith has been undermined and who have turned away from it. It will be able to take its proper place in society. But the main thing is that this transformation of the party will signal a complete departure from a totalitarian, authoritarian, and bureaucratic regime.

It goes without saying that the direct, fearless, and in many ways new assessment of the path being followed by the party and society is impressive.

Of course, the draft is somewhat eclectic. On the whole this is understandable. We have already left behind Article 6 of the constitution, or rather we are in the process of leaving it behind, but we have not yet arrived at a party that operates within the framework of a parliamentary democracy. Only the first few steps are being taken. And, of course, they are very hard to take. Because the hardest thing is the revolution in consciousness.

This party program is being created in the very first stage of the switch to a market economy. But we can also indicate how long the program is designed to operate for. Needless to say, the chronology is neither here nor there—as we know, the same thing has happened before in our history. But nevertheless it is possible to designate a stage, a limit, which will mark the fulfillment of this program and the need to establish a new one. Of course, it is still too early to talk about this. But all the same, we would hope that the new program will not be with us for too long. After all, we are now paying a bitter price for failing to move.

I would like to see greater clarity in defining the CPSU's functions in protecting the interests of the party's emerging social base. As the state party, the present CPSU used to uphold primarily the interests of the state employer while posing as the protector of working people's interests. But the developing market economy, the associated changes in society, and the transformation of the CPSU into a real political party call for changes in this field as well. It is obvious that the party will make the transition from the position of an apparatus of power, an employers' apparatus, to the positions of working people, of people who live by their labor.

I would also like to see in the draft program more precise terminology with regard to the state structure of the new

Union. Certain sections of the draft mention the term "sovereign republic," while others talk about a "sovereign state." What is this? Is it simply some confusion of terms? Or is there a deeper meaning behind it? But when we are talking about such extremely important and basic concepts, and, moreover, concepts that attract such keen and even painful attention, it is obvious that greater clarity and precision in formulating terms is needed.

On the whole, however, the draft program is very close to our position, that of the Estonian Communist Party. Many of its ideas and provisions are very much in accord with our own program aims. And from this point of view, many ideas and principles which previously came into being in the Communist Parties of various republics and in the Estonian Communist Party, those which we put forward at the 28th CPSU Congress, no longer look like Estonian or any other heresy. I would say that the draft has gone further, it is better and more radical. And that is good. That is how it should be. It was formulated at a later stage and to a greater extent it makes allowance for the demands of the times, the changes that are occurring in public awareness, and new trends. The inevitability and objective nature of the processes that are taking place are increasingly making themselves felt.

Needless to say, the draft we are examining today cannot suit that section of the party that does not want changes. It is no accident that definitions such as "Gorbachev's anticommunist faction," "the forced introduction of reactionary market programs," "the anticommunist leadership of the CPSU," and so on are being voiced. The statements from this wing of the party have probably never been so frank, so categorical and threatening, the criticism has never been so aggressive.

It seems that we can count among the serious mistakes committed in this period the fact that there was essentially never any discussion of this confrontation at any level in the CPSU, and the activity of this faction was not discussed.

The right thing to do would obviously have been to hold a wide-ranging party debate before the 28th CPSU Congress, which would have revealed the disposition of forces, helped doubters to make up their minds, clarified the position for those who are disenchanted or who do not understand, and clearly indicated the opposition group, those who oppose the path of changes and are primarily concerned with the narrow party interests of their group, and not with the interests of society.

But the time has come to face the question squarely. And there is just one thing at issue. The new program is something that can and must save the party, something around which those who are seriously concerned for its future can and must unite.

It seems that this wide-ranging debate cannot now be avoided. And in the course of this debate every Communist must define his position. In this instance majority voting cannot and should not decide anything. And at this point a thought of Lenin's springs to mind. It is topical even today: "A little more knowledge of the facts and a little less quibbling claiming to be communist principle." If we think a little less about notoriously irreconcilable matters of principle and make a more sensible assessment of the situation in which the party and the country find themselves, the CPSU might survive and find its feet.

In our program documents we have always stressed that we believe it essential to participate in the ongoing democratic processes in the CPSU. And now we are making our choice in support of the new program, in support of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, since in him and his policies we see the guarantee of the preservation of a viable party and the implementation of reforms.

Self-purification, not transformation into another party—that is the way to renew the CPSU.

26 July Speeches

Guseletov: Program Must Help Win Elections

PM0108134991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 91 Second Edition p 3

["Account" of speech delivered by B.P. Guseletov, Sverdlovsk Engineering-Pedagogical Institute lecturer, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 26 July]

[Text] I would like to return to a topic which was raised here yesterday by Comrade Abalkin, and today by Comrade Latsis, when they said that it is extremely important right now to define the main criteria for assessing the draft Party Program submitted by the program commission for consideration by the CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

This has already been mentioned in a number of speeches here at the Plenum which had previously been published in certain party newspapers. Frequently they have pointed out that it is very important for the program to preserve the unity of the party. No less often has it been suggested that the program should retain the legacy of the party's notions of socialism, communism, Marxism, and Leninism. In my opinion it is not necessary to reject these criteria out of hand, since life has convincingly demonstrated that those who forget their history come to repent it bitterly. But at the same time we must bear in mind that these are criteria which have prevailed in the party for a long time, criteria which date back decades to a time when we were the only party whose position was enshrined in the Constitution, a party which ruled both in the name of the people and in the name of the state.

Today, when a multiparty system has beem established in the country once and for all, at least at the legislative level of the Soviet Union and of most of the republics, when presidential elections have been held in the republics, and the leaders of a number of major Russian cities

have been elected, life has already convincingly demonstrated that we are entering an entirely new era, a new stage of our development, when a tough political struggle for power lies ahead of us.

I believe that speaking today of loyalty to the teaching from this viewpoint would not be entirely correct. However, in order not to start up a political debate, although I largely disagree with what Comrade Prigarin has said here, allow me to briefly cite Franz Mehring, Karl Marx's well-known biographer, who said more than 80 years ago: "To swear on the words of the teacher is merely the sad fate of a school which claims to know the ultimate immutable truth. Marxism does not know any such truth. It sprang from events themselves, from historical development, and it changes together with it." Therefore I believe that today the main criterion of the program which we are submitting for discussion should be its competitiveness in the struggle with other programs, and also and primarily the people's backing.

If this programs helps us to win the elections which are coming up in the very near future, it will mean that our program is correct, that we have found the right approach. The upshot will be that if we win the elections, this will make the question of party unity much more easy to resolve than the exhortations for unity voiced from this rostrum. Only then will the party have the people's backing, and party members will, of course, stop leaving its ranks.

I would also like to note that comrades have very often cited the opinion of Communists and of individual party organizations here. I believe that the time has come when it is necessary, speaking about Communists' opinions, to refer to the findings of sociological research, otherwise this selective approach to these opinions will prove very hard. We must, of course, take account of Communists' views in drawing up our program. Permit me to cite findings obtained very recently—two months ago—by a group of the Institute of Philosophy and Law in our city.

Having carried out a poll among Communists they discovered (I will not cite all the details but mention just some very interesting points) that the biggest section of Communists (31 percent of those polled) declared: "The CPSU, just like other parties, has the right to be the ruling party, if it wins this right during the election campaign to the soviets. In alliance with the democrats, many Communists can act as the political buttress of perestroyka today." At the same time, those who are calling for turning the party back, so to speak, and installing it in its former place in society, number no more than 12 percent. I believe that precisely this opinion of the Communists should serve as the basis. And the draft program which has been submitted to us fits in entirely with this mood.

I would also like to say that the draft programs which we received earlier have been discussed in great detail. I spoke at several plants and institutes. We held a conference in Perm which attracted great interest. And in this context I would like to say that it is, of course, necessary to publish as soon as possible this draft, and also alternative drafts of the program, so as to ensure that the discussion is more constructive and interesting.

As for critical remarks, it seems to me that the second section, which has rightly been cut back, has nontheless not been transformed into lessons of history but rather into a historical excursion. Therefore it is obviously necessary simply to return to the original version and make it into lessons of history. In the final, fifth, section, which deals with the party, a paragraph has unjustifiably been dropped which dealt with the right of election to congress by platforms (with reference to Lenin). An entirely correct thesis, in my opinion.

I would also like to return to an idea which I have already spoken about—the need to enhance the status of Communist deputies, and especially members of the Union or republic Supreme Soviets. I believe that this should be reflected both in the program and in the statutes.

I believe that the program (and we must realize this very clearly) is only an element, the initial element of the election struggle which we must embark on right now. Yesterday, reading the KURANTY newspaper, I noticed that Democratic Russia has already announced the creation of preparatory committees for the election of mayors in a number of cities and for the upcoming local elections. And it is the discussion of this program, and the nomination of candidate deputies from the party which should mark the beginning of our election campaign. This is because, if you take a look at the actions of our opponents, life has demonstrated that the majority of new parties base their activities precisely on deputies who have the opportunity to engage in political struggle and make very active use of this opportunity. The deputies from our party virtually never feature either in the mass media, or on television, or in the country's political life.

I believe that a party election campaign headquarters should be set up in the near future and embark on its work. Incidentally, I proposed this back in November of last year. I am convinced that we cannot and must not squander our time like this any more, especially since there is less and less of it left.

And finally, the last point. If we analyze historical experience attentively, especially the postwar development of most of the Western countries in which progressive democratic states have taken shape, we will see that one of the guarantees of effective development was the presence in their political spectrum of powerful mass socialist or left-wing parties which were prepared to wage a tough political struggle in nationwide elections. Today, essentially everywhere, with the exception of Britain, Germany, and Finland, left-wing parties are in power. Therefore, in speaking about the program today, we must note in particular that we have to transform

ourselves into such a powerful socialist mass party which would above all wage a struggle for votes, and do so not by proclamations of loyalty to its ideals but by demonstrating its practical skill in implementing state leadership, promoting the economic development of our society, ensuring social protection, guaranteeing human rights, and strengthening political democracy within society. Only in this case do we have a chance of success.

Kachanov: 'Clear, Precise' Program Needed

PM0108130191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 91 Second Edition p 3

["Account" of speech delivered by M.N. Kachanov, member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Control Commission, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 26 July]

[Text] I am a party veteran and perhaps I lack the patience to be able to talk calmly. There is one fact that gives me particular concern. Thirty years ago the party leadership and Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev were presented with my 32-page letter which raised the question: Can we talk about building communism when we have not yet built socialism in our country? So you can imagine what I feel today when we discuss such vital questions of the life of our party and state, when we in Lithuania are feeling insulted, humiliated, and betrayed. But life demands decisions, composure, and struggle. So I will try to keep my emotions in check. But when I mounted this rostrum I was aware of the great sense of responsibility with which I want to convey to the members of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission, and all of you, Dear Comrade Communists, seated here, my own personal idea, one wrought by my 52 years in the party. My idea is as follows.

I will start with what Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov was saying: "The president must not be lost for the sake of the party and the party must not be lost for the sake of the president." But how can this be accomplished? We must have a program that will unite the party and unite the people. At any rate, unite all the democratic forces who hold sacred our heroic, tragic, and immortal homeland—the Soviet Union! Therefore we must be conscious of the threat we face: Either we join the mainstream of the development of modern civilization or we take suicidal steps backward—to the restoration of capitalism or revival of totalitarianism.

We cannot allow either to happen, nor must we underestimate any of these dangers! Are we fated to perish like the Byzantine or Roman states or are we capable of continuing the historic upward flight effected by the peoples of Russia in October 1917? I am profoundly convinced that the Soviet people can continue this upward flight! All we need is for the party to find the strength to elaborate a political line enabling it to act in that direction.

The party needs a clear, precise, truthful, exacting, and, I would say, people-minded program. If the program is to play such a positive and unifying role, two fundamental tasks have to be resolved: First, we must adopt a totally serious and responsible approach to the theoretical interpretation of our Soviet history. Second, we have to elaborate a political line expressing the peoples' hopes and aspirations. If we have neither of these, we will not resolve the tasks.

As for theoretical interpretation, we are all threatened by the sword of Damocles of an old delusion. We are guilty of an improbable confusion of ideas: "state socialism," "totalitarian socialism." And we simply cannot grasp that we did not build socialism, we merely created early (initial) socialism, and Stalinism and the Stalinist ethos deflected us and blocked us. What do you imagine is going on in our consciousness—social and party—and all over our press? We assess and portray socialism on the basis of Stalinism! What if I ask you: Pray tell me, is it possible to portray capitalism on the basis of Bonapartism? Is it possible to portray the full essence of bourgeois society on the basis of fascism? Do you not remember that the Bourbons, at the beginning of the last century, cursed liberty, equality, and fraternity—the ideas of the Great French Revolution—for having enabled Napoleon to declare himself emperor and become a usurper?

It is time we saw that Stalinism was a phenomenon of a transitional era. It resulted from certain subjective and objective historical circumstances. These circumstances led to Stalinism, which made its mark and led us away from socialism and blocked the road. Now tell me, if you please, was it any different in history? What did France go through after the 1789 revolution while the capitalist mode of production was being established? That took more than 100 years. So the program ought to clearly state that Stalinism was a phenomenon of the transitional era. It delayed the development of socialist society and caused harm.

It must also be clearly established that the history of the Soviet Union has two fundamental distinctive features which must be recorded. The previous comrade said about the October Revolution that it was the creation of the peoples, a socialist revolution.

The second point is that it absolutely must reflect the fact that the Soviet peoples followed Lenin, followed those great ideas and selflessly built a new society and defended it with courage and heroism, and that it was a supreme achievement for the whole of world civilization. The modern world and modern civilization are currently headed toward a higher type of development and socialism is part and parcel of this process. The socialist mode of production has entered the arena of history and is an integral part of it. There is absolutely no denying this. Any denigration of it is intolerable.

The final point I want to mention is what was the main reason for the appearance of Stalinism. It absolutized the role of violence, that is something everyone knows. But people forget that the laws of the historical process were

underestimated. Now we have embarked on perestroyka. Are we are conducting perestroyka within the framework of historical laws or within the framework of a variety of arbitrary notions and wishes?

What has history shown? What laws operate in a transitional period? The first is a single market in the country. We have started to destroy it on the pretext of economic independence. The second law is unity of the country, a unified state as a most important political condition, as a political factor within the confines of all territories and borders. Now we are trying to destroy this unity. The third law is that the centralization of power is the only means of completing all the transformations of the transitional era. The fourth is the democratization of all aspects of social life and general elections. All these laws are interrelated, indissoluble, and confirmed by historical experience. Moreover: When was it the capitalist countries started to introduce democratization really intensively? In the 1930s, of course, particularly after World War II, when they realized that early, young socialism was impossible to eliminate, that it was an historical reality that had to be faced.

So unless, when examining questions of our Union treaty, we enshrine in it guarantees of the strengthening of our Soviet federation and guarantees of the consolidation of the socialist mode of production, we will again experience the most enormous upheavals in our history.

Klaucens: Latvian Communists Suffering 'Anxiety'

PM3107140291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 5-6

["Account" of speech delivered by A.P. Klaucens, member of the CPSU Central Control Commission, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, and first secretary of Riga City Latvian Communist Party Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 26 July]

[Text] Each of us participants in this plenum has brought with him the sentiments and feelings that are worrying people today.

For the Communists and inhabitants of Latvia, this means concern for the situation in the country and party, for their future. Shortly beforehand, resolutions addressed to the CPSU Central Committee Plenum were adopted in the majority of party organizations, at meetings and plenums of party committees. They put forward the demand for the adoption of urgent measures to prevent the disintegration of the state, extricate the country from the crisis, and rally the CPSU's ranks. Proposals are put forward for the speediest convocation of a CPSU congress and the renewal of the party leadership.

Great anxiety was caused among Latvia's Communists by the Russian Communist Party's heavy defeat in the recent elections and by the decision to leave the party on the part of a number of former leaders and initiators of perestroyka, who were in the immediate entourage of the USSR president, our general secretary. Let me add to this list the requiem article for the CPSU by A.N. Yakovlev, senior adviser to the president, at the moment of proclamation of the new movement with the clearly expressed intention of splitting the CPSU and creating a new political party on its basis.

If you take into account the fact that in the republic itself a continuing process is taking place whereby the social system is being replaced in favor of the returning and emerging national bourgeoisie, the people are growing poor, and the new authorities exercise diktat and suppress all dissidence, it becomes obvious that there are patently no grounds for optimism.

True, there was London, there is the Novo-Ogarevo process, but today all this is, so to speak, bypassing the republic and the peoples living there. The vast majority of party organizations see the cause of all the country's ills and the people's sufferings not only in objective factors, but primarily in the mistakes and miscalculations of the top party and state leadership. I will be frank, among Communists there are growing anti-Gorbachev sentiments and distrust in the successful completion of what has been started, and pessimism, apathy, appeasement, and trimming are on the increase. It is my duty to say this, because it is not only connected with the activity of the party organizations, but also with their increasing disintegration and the gulf between the party masses and their leader.

It is clear that the party leader should be in the forefront, but he must also know and take account of the masses' opinion. I am not saying this in order to reproach you, esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich. Clearly you see much further than we do. But you must understand how hard it is today for us to implement the Central Committee's policy, if the Communists stop trusting us.

Now for the main item on the agenda, the draft CPSU Program. Back home, we have been able to assess the three latest versions of the Program. We did this with wide participation by the party aktiv and party gorkom [city committee] and raykom [rayon committee] secretaries and through the discussion club of party committee secretaries under the Riga party gorkom, with the participation of scientists belonging to the social council.

The present version, in our opinion, is superior to the previous versions, and could be adopted for discussion in the party.

At the same time I would like to align myself with the opinion voiced at the Plenum, that its main drawback is the unjustified departure from a number of Marxist-Leninist tenets. We believe that this approach is not natural, it is more of a tribute to fashion. The party can only be strong when it absorbs within itself the best, foremost elements of practical experience and science and uses its own experience, its own—albeit contradictory—history. Let me give you a concrete example.

When the elections were held to the republic Supreme Soviet and local soviets in fall 1989 and spring 1990, the Latvian Communist Party was not united, it was torn by intraparty strife. At the time we were in the process of splitting, as you remember. The party had no concrete action program, and discipline and organization were on the decline. Conversely, the Latvian People's Front had a clear program and iron discipline. As a result the Latvian Communist Party suffered defeat and became the opposition party. And although today the Latvian People's Front does not proclaim itself to be a party, in current, day-to-day affairs it operates as an organization with tough discipline, having taken this over from us along with our former party functionaries.

All the most important decisions, tactics, strategy, and draft laws pass through the People's Front Duma. All cadre appointments are decided on the basis of strict orientation toward the ideas of the People's Front. The amorphousness proposed for the party in the draft CPSU Program, manifested in the formula on membership and participation in the work of party organizations, is a departure from Leninist principles of party building. Such provisions cannot be adopted if the party really wants to participate in the power struggle.

Different CPSU detachments today work in different conditions, some of them (like the Latvian Communist Party) in opposition conditions. These peculiarities are not properly reflected in the draft Program.

I wish also to put forward a proposal on the procedure for organizing the discussion of the draft Program within the party. We have insufficient experience here. I think it would be no bad thing to remember and utilize the experience of organizing discussions in the party in the Leninist period. Here it is important to define a mechanism for taking opinions into account and formulating agreed decisions by democratic means. Not to distance people, but to persuade them and draw them closer—that is the main concern of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, and indeed all the party committees. Comrade Makhov spoke about this yesterday. I agree with him.

And another thing. Interest in the theory of the communist movement has increased recently among Communists. We were all very interested yesterday to hear the speeches of "Red" Professor A.A. Denisov and other scientists. In our republic we have seen this for ourselves. Two scientists from our Academy of Sciences—Comrades Kanter and Stecurin—physicists and nonparty people, responding to the imperative of the time and drawing on the laws of society and nature, have written a work demonstrating the correctness and viability of Marxism-Leninism in present-day conditions. This work, in the form of a pamphlet (samizdat—we could not get it printed), is selling like hotcakes among the party organizations. Scientists have become active assistants to the city party organization. On this basis, I propose that a system of involving scientists in the discussion of the draft CPSU Program be considered.

And last—about anticommunism. This wave is sweeping through our country. Listening to Radio Rossii today and watching certain programs on Russian Television, you have to observe that in their anticommunist thrust they surpass certain foreign radio stations. All this prompts indignation among Communists and surprise among foreigners. In our republic this process is coupled with the resurgence of profascist organizations, the stepping up of attacks on the Armed Forces as an alleged army of occupation, and direct threats to Communists.

Let me cite some examples. On 16 February this year, the anniversary of the formation of the Latvian SS division was marked for the first time since 1945, quite openly, with the support and participation of republic Supreme Soviet deputies and with republic radio and television coverage. A few days later they announced, also for the first time since the war, a gathering of the former bandits known as the "forest brothers," at whose hands hundreds, even thousands of Soviet activists suffered in the first postwar years. And this is not done without the knowledge of the new authorities.

And here is what People's Deputy Kostando, who is well known in the republic, proclaims. Speaking on television recently, he stated that the forces that are beating up and robbing people are inspired and led by the Communist Party. "Our spiritual force will not help here," he says. "Neither Britons, nor Americans, nor Swedes will come to our aid here. Military force is needed. Set up self-defense detachments in the localities, in the cities and districts [volosti], contact the Supreme Soviet Commission on Defense and Internal Affairs. We must rise up once again to drive out the 'red fog,' as in 1919." In another speech he stated that the Communists must be annihilated quickly. They will shout, he said, and call for help. But if we act quickly, Moscow will only be able to shrug its shoulders.

In this connection I have two proposals. The topic of anticommunism should be more fully reflected in the draft CPSU Program. And second, the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo should take the initiative, on the basis of international pacts, to adopt appropriate measures at state level.

Also in this connection, about the recent decree by Russian President Mr. B.N. Yeltsin. Much was said about this decree yesterday. Reference was made to similar decrees in other republics. We have passed through a complex period in the development of our Communist Party, and survived. It will be hard for people in Russia. I want to express solidarity and support for Russia's Communists. And, of course, in this case this is the signal for attack not only in Russia, but in other regions, including ours. We must prepare, we must rally.

In conclusion I would like to say that the Latvian Communist Party has a glorious history rich in revolutionary and combat traditions. Latvia's present-day Communists will continue it.

Lavrentyev: 'CPSU is the Party of Reform'

PM3107090591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition p 6

["Account" of speech delivered by S.N. Lavrentyev, secretary of the Bashkir State University Party Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 26 July]

[Text] Many speakers have said that there is a dichotomy in party consciousness, a crisis of party consciousness. Certainly, there is. Discussion of the draft party Program should be one means of overcoming this crisis. The means that will renew our party consciousness and transform the CPSU into a renewed democratic party.

In this connection I would like to draw your attention to a fundamental provision of the draft Program: The CPSU is the party of democratic reform. It is forcing us to take another look at the practical work that we are doing. Take this factor. It has become usual to set Communists against democrats. Is that right? After all, those who describe themselves as democrats are not democrats as such. And where did they come from in our recently totalitarian society? From what retort or laboratory, so to speak, could they have emerged? So far what we have before us is an inadequate democracy. We Communists once again bear responsibility for this because the CPSU is the only party that will shoulder the burden of historical responsibility.

The formulation of the question that we should be the party of democratic reform is making it necessary to set the task of shaping a real developed democratic society. But democratic consciousness can only be fostered amid accord. Therefore, in areas where we lack power, we must strive to form a constructive opposition. Democratic society has an opposition, but it must be constructive, that is bear its share of responsibility for the state of affairs in society. For that it must be enlisted in joint actions and talks and dialogue must be held with it. We also have the task of shaping a responsible opposition since our party is the largest and most responsible. In those areas where we have found ourselves in opposition, we must set an example by responsibly serving the people's interests. That is how I see the words of the draft Program: The CPSU must be the party of democratic reform.

Now a few words about the Russian president's decree. I myself am secretary of a primary party organization and have precisely the same attitude toward it as everyone here in this hall, but I would like to approach it from a different angle, from the viewpoint of a popular saw, so to speak: Every cloud has a silver lining. If we think about it, this decree should impel us to implement more rapidly the ideas inscribed in the statutes. I am talking about Communists' work in areas where we often lose political battles. We have, after all, virtually lost a year, having done nothing to shape party structures in areas of residence. I am not talking about housing operation offices because according to the decree party organizations cannot now be set up even there. Territorial party organizations constitute a system of party clubs, party centers, party special-interest organizations, professional party organizations, and so on. I repeat, we have been talking about this for a long time, but we have done nothing and we are now gesturing helplessly and shrieking "Help."

A word about the party statutes. We are criticizing them today although they express the clear-cut idea that there should be horizontal structures at work within the party in addition to vertical structures. I am not referring to platforms alone but also to structures like, for instance, a party business club involving all entrepreneurs and prominent directors or a party club for scientists and the creative intelligentsia. We still lack structures of this kind. But they could help the party acquire a new image. I am saying that the Statutes which we adopted at the 28th Congress don't work. It is not the Statutes themselves but the party committees that should be criticized for this.

Now to something else.

It has been said here that the draft lacks specifics. That is true. But let's recall the party's election platform. It contained a whole host of specific matters but I don't remember the question being considered at all of how this election platform is to be put into practice. Yet it is now time to amend it. The question of nominating candidate USSR people's deputies from the party is on the agenda today. Perhaps this is also something that will make it possible to analyze how we are putting our election platform into practice.

Last. The draft that we are discussing today is a draft innovative Program. Expressing the opinion of my colleagues—party organization secretaries (and I am chairman of the Bashkir council of primary party organization secretaries), I suggest that this document be published as soon as possible.

Without doubt, it is not ideal, but there is also party discussion to enrich it with the ideas of the party masses.

Prigarin: Program Democratic in Nature

PM0108142791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 91 Second Edition p

["Account" of speech delivered by A.A. Prigarin, head of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat Political Analysis and Forecasting Center, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 26 July]

[Text] I would like to remind Comrade Latsis that Lenin did not merely set up a social democratic party, but a social democratic worker's party.

I think that these two currents within the worker movement are legally entitled to exist but Communists must nevertheless remain Communists and social democrats

remain social democrats. Everyone must describe themselves as they are and not don masks or use different epithets. It would be ridiculous were I to call myself a social democrat.

Now to the crux of the matter. I think it can be considered established fact—and Comrade Denisov agrees, this is his idea, as does Comrade Martynov—that the program that has been submitted to us is not the party's program but that of a broad public movement and is of a general democratic nature. If you drop the words "socialism" or "socialist idea" from two or three places and the word "communism" from another, you don't have to change the substance of a single provision of the program and no one would even notice.

Does this mean that the document that we have been offered should be rejected as such? I think not.

It would indeed be good to suggest it as the general program of the movement for democratic reforms, but if it is used as a starting point I think that it should contain the kind of ideas that would render this document the Communist Party's program.

Above all I think that we must enshrine in it the idea—and once again I fully agree with Denisov—that communism is not a speculative system foisted on society but the result of mankind's natural historical development based on the progress of productive forces. Just like socialism, if we still regard it as the first stage toward a communist society.

On this premise I deem it absolutely essential for the program to enshrine the stance of the 28th party congress to the effect that we are the party of socialist choice and the communist perspective and not back down on this.

The historical section must say—and it is strange that it has not been said—that the October Revolution was a socialist revolution—the Great October Socialist Revolution—and as for the tasks that it set the people, it must say that it set them the task of socialist transformations rather than merely accomplishing the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution.

Where the civil war is mentioned, it should say in more clear-cut terms that the civil war arose as a result of opposition from the former ruling classes to the revolutionary transformations and it was they who initiated the civil war that began 18 months after the October Revolution and was tied up (as General Surkov rightly said here) with foreign military intervention against our country.

The section that talks about the kind of society that we have created must clearly say what kind of society this is. There may be differing views on this: The main elements of socialism may be said to have been created; a period of socialist building may be said to be under way and continuing; state socialism may be said (and I subscribe to this view) to be a system of universal statization not only of ownership but also of public and political life and that this must be seen as the first stage of socialist development.

From this viewpoint, I think that we must also say more clearly what perestroyka is. I agree that perestroyka was necessary, I would be even more cutting and say that it was historically inevitable since the previous model of a socialist society... (it is inaccurate to say that it failed to prove its incapability, Mikhail Sergeyevich) became historically drained because in its initial stages of development it proved its supreme efficiency both during the war and during industrialization.

It is therefore possible to clarify where we are going. The section that begins with these words now simply records the fact that we are in a period of transition, and since it did not first say from where, nor does it say (and this is one of the main questions) where we are going. I think that we are moving away from a society of state socialism to a society of democratic socialism, where social ownership is linked with wide-ranging political democracy and social justice. That is precisely how I would describe this society.

Nevertheless, one of this document's main shortcomings is the fact that it does not state the situation that we are now in.

Two currents are engaged in a struggle today in our country: a struggle to bring capitalism back to our country and to develop socialism afresh. The draft program says nothing about the danger of restoring capitalism in our country although this danger is both economically and politically a real one. We cannot shut our eyes to this since both propaganda and the mass media are saying this in a blunt and overt manner.

The program only says this—"We oppose all-out privatization." But that is waging war on shadows—no country in the world has all-out privatization and there isn't an idiot in the country who would call for all-out privatization. Even capitalism's prime champions such as G.Kh. Popov say that 20-25 percent of property should stay in state hands.

There is no and can be no all-out privatization today. It has never existed in mankind's history. Therefore the struggle between the two currents must be mentioned in most definite terms. People are trying to tell us that the line between capitalism and socialism has been eroded. I think that is quite wrong. Surplus value is a reality. Surplus product is a material reality. It either falls into the hands of private owners or it remains in the people's hands. The purpose of moving on to democratic socialism is to turn the state from an owner into an administrator under the people's control.

I think that the debate under way in the country and the political struggle being waged by our adversaries against the Communist Party are the best proof that they are

well aware of the difference between socialism and capitalism. While we pretend that there is no such difference.

Socialism and the market must not be set against one another. Socialism and a particular market model can be set against one another. But a particular market system depends above all on property relations. I suggest that the program return once more to something that we noted sternly a year ago at the 28th Congress, namely private labor ownership; all forms of ownership that preclude man's exploitation by man are to be employed and priority of popular forms of ownership—collective, public, and socialist—is guaranteed. Terms can be discussed. In this connection I think that the draft program is going back on the decisions adopted by the 28th congress. From that viewpoint it would be a good thing to abandon the term "mixed economy." We have already evolved somewhat: socialist, socially-oriented social-market, and so on.

Now a few words about the social section of the program. At a sitting of the sociopolitical commission I compared the texts of the proposed draft program and the UN Universal Human Rights Declaration. Here we have the Universal Human Rights Declaration: "Every person has the right to work, to freely choose his work, to just and favorable conditions of labor, and to protection against unemployment.

"Every person, without discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

"Every person has the right to the standard of living... required to maintain his health and prosperity and that of his family and the right to security in the event of unemployment, illness, disablement, loss of a spouse, old age, or any other loss of means of subsistence."

Here there is evidently more socialism than in the document that has been submitted to us, although this declaration was adopted in 1948 by 50 capitalist states.

I think that this document will damage the party if it is published in the form in which it has been given to us. I think that the draft decision should avoid extremes and not reject it or say that it should be taken as a base. I would suggest that the Program Commission finalize it within the shortest possible period of time and publish it for discussion—not merely finalized "with consideration for comments made," our decision should also note how it should be finalized. After publication no ordinary discussion, but the partywide discussion of the draft for which the rules make provision, should be announced. This constitutes a tougher and more clear-cut note obliging all party organizations to hold this kind of discussion at party meetings and adopt various decisions.

What is more, I would like our decision to say that the alternative draft CPSU platforms currently being elaborated should also be published. The Marxist Platform is also preparing documents of this kind.

Now a few more words about the actions take[n] Rutskoy's group. Virtually all of us know that ... group's constituent conference is scheduled for 2 August to set up a parallel party that will declare that it has been set up within the CPSU. I deem this inadmissible and think that an appropriate decision should be adop[ted]. Why precisely by a CPSU Central Committee plenu[m] that's the first question? Because this group will dec[lare] itself part of the CPSU and not accountable to the Russian Communist Party. Consequently, we should react.

The second question is—isn't it too early, won't we be giving Rutskoy and his group publicity? No, it's not too early. Because we are always late. I think that a preemptive warning is necessary that the party Central Committee will not recognize as CPSU members those people who join the Democratic Party of Communists of Russia. That is a very important warning. Otherwise we may encounter a situation where we once again have two first secretaries of two Russian Communist Parties in our Politburo.

Armenia's Sarkisyan: CPSU Must Reform

PM3107160791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jul 91 Second Edition p 6

["Account" of speech delivered by A.G. Sarkisyan, first secretary of Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 26 July]

[Text] This is the first time that I have taken part in a Central Committee plenum and a number of factors prompted me to speak. First and foremost, the views expressed even here about the processes experienced by the Armenian Communist Party. All the indications are that comrades have been denied sufficiently full and clear information on what is going on in the region and especially what is happening with the Armenian Communist Party.

First, however, I want to express some views on the party's draft program. On the whole the draft meets the interests of Armenian Communists. I think, and I agree with many of the comments voiced here, that it needs further work. For our part, at the 30th Armenian Communist Party Congress we adopted the main provisions of a program based on the fundamental ideas of socialist theory and social justice and on our people's vital interests. A new party program is being prepared.

We are convinced that only a reformed party, which in conditions of the emerging multiparty system has a vital need to clearly define its place and role in society's life, can win back its prestige.

No matter how much we want to preserve the whole party's former position of power in the country, this is already surely impossible. With the creation of a federal state the inevitable will happen. The republic communist

parties, while in general standing on a common ideological foundation, will carry out their own programs and resolve concrete tasks of a local character, as it were. Otherwise they may be left without the support of the people and the local organs of the republic in question. Today calls to become once again a statewide party expressing the interests of all the people sound anachronistic, to say the least.

We are also convinced that the strengthening of the power structures of administration through the efforts of party committees will be temporary in character, but the result is not hard to predict. From the Armenian Communist Party's example, it can be asserted that disregard for the laws of social development, lagging behind rapidly developing processes, and an unwillingness or simply an inability to compete with the new political forces for people's minds inevitably leads to the logical outcome—the loss of power.

Indeed, the Armenian Communist Party lost power a year ago. However, it must be said honestly that it suffered defeat long before it lost power. And, unfortunately, it was a quite predictable defeat. The party ceased to exist as a party long ago. It was transformed from a political organization into an organ deeply integrated with elements of state management with, at the summit, individuals, not always honest ones, who arrogated to themselves the right to govern on behalf of the whole party. And when the people received the right to choose they began to turn away en masse, as it were, from all those who either consciously or otherwise represented the old system. In this sense too after the loss of power, the party was left on the floor, to be blunt, and had to resolve the main task—survival.

But what began after the party's defeat? The new forces set about establishing themselves and began pressuring and openly persecuting the party. A succession of decisions was adopted restricting the activity of the Communist party first and foremost. We fully understand the alarm of Russian Communists because you can see here what is surely a specific scenario that is clearly being reenacted. I believe that our big mistake was that we did not monitor the processes taking place in other republic parties and failed to analyze and anticipate events. Whereas in the "enemy camp," all those things were done at what may be called a modern, scientific level.

This is how it happened: First, a decision was adopted on the depoliticization of state organs and state enterprises, institutions, organizations, educational establishments, and military subunits of the Republic of Armenia. Next, there was a resolution on the property of political parties and sociopolitical organizations and a law on sociopolitical organizations sharply restricting the party's activity as a whole. And finally, on 17 April, when we, in the process of restructuring ourselves, began to create territorial party organizations, the "final, crushing" decision was adopted on nationalizing the property of the Armenian Communist Party and the former Leninist Communist Youth League.

Clearly, there was an absolute confidence that the party would not survive, it would not get up off its knees, and that it could not exist. Here, it must be said, a phenomenon clearly emerged—the phenomenon of survival. And the fact that the party did survive is due solely to the fact that there was a healthy backbone in the party, that there were healthy forces at grassroots level within the party and not at the apex of its power structures. And in these conditions the main aim was to preserve party unity. Many of our opponents dreamed that there would be a split, that we would be turned into a political sect, and that it would be easy to finish us off. But we maintained our unity even though a group of social democrats left us. They left and dissolved into the general pattern of emerging parties.

No less important was the task of having to stabilize the situation in the party. The mass exodus which began in August last year was arrested as early as January. And this was achieved primarily by the fact that the party had begun to put forward clear positions of its own on all the questions of principle and primarily defined its attitude toward the Union treaty, saying that it retains the position of a party of socialist choice and stating that Armenia must be in the same Union as Russia. And it is no coincidence that interest in us increased, people began to respect us again, and in principle began to take notice of us.

And the consequence is that in the past few months 130 people have joined the party. This is pleasing because, as I have already said, last year we experienced a mass exodus from the party. It can be boldly said that in principle the signs of stabilization appeared.

I, of course, am far from thinking or urging Russia's Communists to follow our example. On the contrary, I believe that on no account should one back down or fail to defend one's vital interests.

And the final thing that I wanted to talk about is the Karabakh problem, which cannot be ignored. This is the fourth year that this bleeding wound has stained the country's map. Recently there has been some movement, a glimmer of light, and a process of negotiations has begun. But against the background of the continuing deportation of the Armenian population from Shaumyanskiy Rayon, against the background of clashes, outright hostilities, and deaths this process cannot lead to success.

We are absolutely convinced that the Karabakh problem should have been resolved consistently and purposefully a long time ago. It is necessary to declare a moratorium on all actions which aggravate the situation today, and clearly this must be done by beginning with an appeal from the leaders of the two republics and surely the president of the country, as guarantors of the fulfillment of obligations, and then an intensive process of talks to get out of this impasse step by step must be started.

No one will forgive us the deaths of people, today no one is going to ask who is to blame. People are dying and there must be accountability for that.